

ASBURY SEMINARY
1092011488



ABSTRACT

Why do people drop out of church? Results of case study interviews, statistical testing, and questionnaires indicate that persons are more likely to drop out if they are shame-prone, have severe interpersonal conflicts, have lost status in church through personal failures, or are married women.

A statistical study of two small rural United Methodist congregations using the TOSCA, Test of Self-Conscious Affect (June Price Tangney et. al., George Mason University, 1989), showed contrary to expectations that attendance per se did not correlate inversely with shame-proneness as expected. In a further study of seventeen church dropouts, dropout women had very high shame-proneness (almost one standard deviation above average) while having below average alpha pride (pride in the entire self rather than in behavior). Dropout men had the reverse, with above average alpha pride and below average shame-proneness. Wives were discovered to be responsible more often for a couple dropping out of church, which corroborates psychological studies of shame-proneness in women.

Church members who were high in shame-proneness yet also faithful attenders showed they had: 1) a strong desire to worship God, 2) stable relationships with at least one other church member, and 3) a growing autonomous self-identity which overcame temptation to withdraw after embarrassing incidents or church fights.

Shame is surveyed in the fields of philosophy, anthropology, fiction and nonfiction, sociology, and psychology. A biblical word study, a study of Christian leaders through history, and comments towards a theology of shame are included. If America is becoming a shame culture, then America needs an evangelism drawing on a more biblical understanding of a healthy identity in Christ versus a shame-based identity, rather than an evangelism that only draws on a sin-guilt-mercy-forgiveness message. A final chapter gives pastoral counseling and administrative techniques for healing and rejuvenating shame-prone persons.

DISSERTATION APPROVAL

This is to certify that the
dissertation entitled

SHAME AND THE CHURCH DROPOUT:

THE EFFECT OF EMBARRASSMENT, HUMILIATION, AND SHAME
ON CHURCH ATTENDANCE IN SMALL RURAL CHURCHES

presented by

Wallace Bernard Cason III

has been accepted towards fulfillment

of the requirements for the

DOCTOR OF MINISTRY degree of

Asbury Theological Seminary

Wilmore, Kentucky

February 6, 1992

Date

February 6, 1992

Date

February 6, 1992

Date

Laurence W. Todd

Mentor

Chaplain John

Internal Reader

Leslie A. Andrews

Director of D. Min. Program

**SHAME AND THE CHURCH DROPOUT:
THE EFFECT OF EMBARRASSMENT, HUMILIATION,
AND SHAME ON CHURCH ATTENDANCE
IN SMALL RURAL CHURCHES**

A Dissertation
Presented to
the Faculty of the Graduate School
Asbury Theological Seminary

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Ministry

by
Wallace Bernard Cason III

May 1992

©1992

Wallace Bernard Cason III

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Chapter	
1. The Problem: Shame and Church Nonattendance In Small Rural United Methodist Churches.....	1
2. The Literature: Studies of Shame, Humiliation, and Embarrassment In Professional Disciplines... ..	14
3. The Literature, Continued: Psychology and Sociology.....	31
4. The Setting: Peaceful United Methodist Church.....	59
5. A Case Study: Three Inactive Couples.....	71
6. Statistical Measurement: Three Shame Proneness Tests.....	82
7. The Investigation Continues: A Questionnaire for Shame Overcomers.....	102
8. Toward A Theology of Shame.....	115
9. Ways to Heal Shame.....	148
Appendix	
A. Test of Self-Conscious Affect.....	159
B. Attendance Related Shame Proneness.....	166
C. Peabody.....	167
D. Data Chart.....	168
E. Letters.....	170
Notes.....	174
Bibliography.....	190

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To my wife, Marge, who originally encouraged me to try for the D. Min. and proved her love by allowing me to buy all the books that I, a total book freak, wanted, so long as it was for the degree. Thank you, thank you!

To my mother, who supported me with lots of love, interest, and hard cash. Thanks, Mom!

To my daughter, Elena, who gave up a lot of trips to catch fish and pick dewberries so I could work on this dissertation.

To my son, Jaska, computer genius, who solved many, many computer problems and who got me up and running again countless times when I couldn't figure out what to do.

To my churches, who allowed me to get away with not visiting them at normal frequency, who allowed me to spend a month a year at seminary, and to the shame-prone members especially, who answered intimate and embarrassing questions courageously and well.

To librarian John Seery of the library at Asbury, and to the other courteous and generous librarians who assisted me for hours at Asbury, at the University of Kentucky, at Mississippi State University, at Ole Miss University, and at Memphis State University. They are the unsung heroes of all dissertation writing and they are appreciated.

To Dr. Steve Seamands, who saw the possibility of a dissertation in my paper on wounded church members, and who encouraged me to write on this subject; and to all my professors at Asbury, every single one of whom helped me greatly.

To Dr. June Price Tangney of George Mason University, who let me administer for free the shame-proneness test she and her colleagues spent so much professional effort to devise, and who kindly advised me by telephone.

To Dr. Nell Schwartz of Texas, who gave the major help of pointing me to Dr. Tangney's shame-proneness test, and who patiently waited for her copy of my work.

To Dr. Nancy Steihler-Thurston of Fuller Seminary, who sent me some of her own useful published work on shame-proneness, and who gave me leads for other material.

To Dr. Sandy Harrison, who cheered for me, and whose Ph.D. dissertation comparing inner healing and secular psychotherapy was an important inspiration.

And last but far from least, to Dr. Lawrence Wood, my advisor, who gave me hope and courage when I needed it the most, and who told me he always knew I could do it.

DEDICATION

TO JESUS

PRINCE OF PEACE

CHAPTER ONE

The Problem: Shame and Church Nonattendance In Small Rural United Methodist Churches

Section I. Introduction

Statement of the Problem: Poor Attendance in Small Rural Methodist Churches

Nonattendance is serious in a big church, but it is disastrous in a small one. Nonattendance of ten people in a church in which 500 attend each Sunday means a nonattendance of only 2%; but in a church of fifty, it means a nonattendance of 20%. Therefore, for the pastor and members of a small church in which fifty members normally attend, the absence of each person is ten times more serious per absentee than for a church where 500 members attend. For the United Methodist Church, the denomination under study in this dissertation, any progress toward recovering inactives in small churches would be very significant, since nearly 43% of United Methodist congregations have under 100 members.¹

Church dropouts are more of a problem in rural areas because typically there is less population influx than in urban areas. There are simply fewer people, or even no people, moving in to take the place of any given nonattender. Although a city church might take the tack that "We can win ten new members for the effort it takes to get one nonattender to return," the small rural church does not always have this option. It is worth the effort to try and win back every single nonattender, because there is often no one to replace them. The hole left by nonattenders in the life of the small rural church is often lasting.

Finally, it takes fewer nonattenders to produce a loss of self-esteem for the small rural church than for a larger church, simply by the nature of num-

bers. A few people gone can leave a big, big gap in small church programs. This can affect morale over time. Therefore, learning the reasons for nonattendance in small churches is of even greater importance than it is for larger churches.

This dissertation addresses the questions: could individual susceptibility to shame (embarrassing circumstances and humiliating incidents) be a significant factor in nonattendance for any members in two small rural churches being studied? If so, how?

The subject of shame-proneness, as the psychological literature refers to this phenomenon of susceptibility to feeling shame, will be addressed herein from as many angles as possible in an attempt to answer these questions. The two churches studied are real, but made as anonymous as possible and given fictitious names. One of the two disguised churches, Peaceful UMC, seemed more shame-prone as a whole and was made the main focus of the study. The other church, Grader's Chapel, appeared much more healthy though smaller in membership. It was included in the statistical studies to enable a comparison with Peaceful UMC and to increase the data base.

How the Subject Came to be Picked

From studying anger to studying shame: Beginning in 1980, from reading John S. Savage's book The Apathetic and Bored Church Member: Psychological and Theological Implications,² and over the next ten years, it became apparent to the writer of this study that anger from humiliating incidents in church was a significant factor in nonattendance for some church members. The original curiosity was about anger. But soon, reflection on certain experiences led to considering shame as one common underlying cause of the anger and hence the nonattendance.

While serving as a church-planting missionary in South America, 1981-1985, the writer observed that coastal Colombians would not come to meetings if they had no shoes. Also, they would not come if they felt their clothes were not good enough. The slightest embarrassing thing, in the beginning, was enough to keep many of these people away permanently. The writer never forgot this experience. Nothing seemed to overcome their pride ... or was it shame?

Finally, the writer did a paper as part of doctoral studies at Asbury Theological Seminary in 1989, in which three nonattending couples from Peaceful UMC were interviewed extensively. While looking for an explanation for anger in these nonattending couples, embarrassment and humiliation were found to be a common underlying emotional theme. It was concluded as a working hypothesis that humiliating incidents or circumstances were major factors in church members deciding to stop attending church. A focus was then made on the feelings of shame, embarrassment, and humiliation behind the expressions of anger that were being heard from the three couples. A search was made of the literature. The term "shame" being the term most frequently encountered in the psychological and sociological literature as a more or less inclusive term for the feelings of embarrassment and humiliation, it was concluded that shame as a factor in church nonattendance should be the central topic of this dissertation.

Focus on shame-proneness: Reading the professional journals suggested that some are more quick to feel humiliation than others; also, those who already have been badly shamed are much more liable to take offense at even the most mild of embarrassing circumstances. The journals referred to this vulnerability to shame as shame-proneness. Therefore, susceptibility to shame, or shame-proneness, became the specific focus within the general topic of shame as a possible factor in nonattendance at church.

A word about pride: In popular thought, pride and shame are the opposite of each other. Theologians have concentrated through the centuries more on pride than on shame. Shame is said in Scripture to be the consequence of pride, i.e., shame is what God makes happen to the wicked as the result of pride.³ Pride also is said in scripture to cause such other things as contention (Pro. 13:10), destruction (Pro. 16:18), hardening of the mind (Daniel 5:20), and self-deception (Obadiah 1:3).

Psychologists, however, because of the highly specific way they define shame as will be seen below, are more inclined to view shame (as they define it) as the cause, rather than the effect, of pride. Whether they are right or not about which comes first, pride or shame, is beside the point; the disagreement is mainly over definitions. The point is, psychologists are making real progress in understanding shame. Psychologists are not really disagreeing with the Bible. They can accept that proud behavior may result in shame and humiliation. What they are really saying is that pride and shame are circular. In computer language, pride and shame are opposite poles in a destructive feedback loop.

To adumbrate chapter three, where it is explained in more detail, psychologists are saying that by shame they mean the malformation of human identity into dysfunctional modes of emotion and behavior. Pride, or grandiosity as psychologists call it, is only one of the manifestations of a poorly formed identity. The need to form an identity is, in fact, now considered by some psychologists to be a drive that is just as important as the drive to survive and procreate. The study of shame-proneness is actually the study of malformed human identity, in an attempt to learn how to heal the dysfunctional modes into which the human psyche goes when such factors as rejection, abandonment, physical abuse, and verbal contempt have resulted in a malformed character and personality.

This means that the study of shame — as a way to understand pride — needs to take on more importance for theologians everywhere. Theologians need to comprehend what psychologists are saying about shame, and take it into account when writing about pride. In fact, it is high time to consider shame as a theological concept in its own right. What is more basic than the study from scripture of how a healthy human identity should be formed?

The Thesis of the Dissertation

It is the thesis of this dissertation that a study of shame and shame-proneness as a psychological factor will yield a better understanding of church nonattendance. Understanding shame should also help in dealing with an array of other issues in church management and pastoral care, such as healing church conflict, pastoral motivation of volunteer efforts, pastoral counseling, lay visitation, and preaching.

A Working Model of Shame and Its Elements

The spectrum of shame: The term "shame" actually has a spectrum of meaning in popular thought, much as the term "love": I "love" my wife and I "love" apple pie, but the same term has different strengths. The English language often denotes degrees through synonyms. For "love," one might go from liking to loving to worshipping. Below, a scale of strength of shame feelings has been constructed for the purposes of this paper, using synonyms for shame:

Strength of Shame Feelings

(Weak)

(Strong)

Modesty...>...Embarrassment...>...Humiliation...>...Toxic Shame

Modesty, on the one hand, refers to a milder shame-based desire for social correctness and decency guiding one's actions in order to avoid greater

shame.⁴ Embarrassment and humiliation refers in this work to a more direct and intense experiencing of shame. Toxic shame is a term psychologists have coined to mean shame so severe that the person becomes dysfunctional.

No effort will be made to distinguish finely between embarrassment and humiliation; they are treated here as synonymous for most purposes, although in reality they refer to different degrees and also different aspects of shame. Embarrassment in its dictionary meaning seems to refer more to private shame feelings of self-consciousness, while humiliation refers to the public shame of being lowered in public esteem. When the term "shame" appears, it will mean generally either embarrassment or humiliation but not modesty, unless it is so stated.

Related terms: Some other investigative constructs concerning shame are low self-esteem, shame-based behavior, guilt, and shame/guilt. Psychologists currently are attempting to arrive at commonly accepted meanings and definitions for such terms. For example, it is the understanding of many in the fields of psychology, sociology, and religion that although shame has certain similarities to guilt, shame differs psychologically from guilt to no small degree. Chapter three will deal with definitions of shame and guilt.

Assumptions: The following list of assumptions is based on personal experience in most cases. Many of the assumptions below were also based on current theories which were found in the literature search before beginning the statistical studies. These assumptions and theories formed the rationale for this work at its beginning:

a) Church people who have been shamed tend to withdraw from and to avoid the person or persons who have shamed them, and to avoid the place where they were shamed. They may feel intense anger at those deemed responsible for their embarrassment, which may express itself in different ways, the most important of which is not attending church.

b) Shamed people tend at first to deny or repress the shaming incident and its emotions. Shame is a form of grief over loss, and denial and repression mean that many persons may feel shame but will tend to hide it, deny it, and be unable to discuss it openly. This means shame will be extremely difficult to analyze because by nature it is an intensely aversive feeling state.

c) The passage of a certain period of time without dealing with the shame tends to reinforce the repression of the incident. This increased repression makes the return to church even less probable, and the willingness to discuss the painful incident even less.

d) Shamed people will deny that they are offended while simultaneously refusing to return to church. They will make many excuses. It takes much work to get to the root of the problem.

e) Shamed people tend either to place blame on others loudly, showing anger, or to withdraw into a shell, blaming themselves.

f) Rural people have a harder time living with a shaming incident because of their permanence in their community. Owning much hard-to-sell land makes it harder to move away. They feel they will have to face the shame for the rest of their lives, and in many cases this is correct, making the shame even more devastating.

g) Lifetime relationships with many people in the rural community give rural people less social distance apart than city people. It is harder for rural people to keep a shameful secret or to move away from shame. Therefore, rural people are more easily shamed than city people, and shame issues are more important to rural people.

h) Rural people who have been shamed have more need for a theology for dealing with shame, because it is a more severe problem for them due to the permanence factor.

i) Rural people have more need than city people for pastoral care when they have experienced something embarrassing, humiliating, or shaming, because of the difficulty of hiding the facts from their community.

j) More pastoral energy must be spent administratively on shame issues. Shame issues must be considered almost at every turn: nominating church officers, speaking to everyone before services, respecting old church furniture, etc., etc.

Test results from this dissertation show that many with fairly high shame-proneness did not let it affect their church attendance; but shame-proneness in church dropouts was statistically quite significant, as chapter six concludes.

Section II. Methodology

The Focus Is Not on a Hypothesis But on Multi-faceted Understanding

The focus of the dissertation is not primarily to examine a hypothesis, although that will be one aspect of the paper. Rather, the focus of the dissertation is to understand as much as possible, using a multi-faceted approach, how shame-proneness as one factor might affect church attendance. The crucial importance of the multi-faceted approach for this purpose is explained below.

Why The Multi-faceted Approach?

The multi-faceted plan of approach is based upon an appreciation of the value of a variety of approaches to any given subject in order to understand it better. The phenomenological approach used by psychotherapists, the participant observation approach used by anthropologists and ethnologists, the case study approach used by sociologists, the fictional story approach used in classical literature, the analytical logic of the philosophical approach, and the faith-based theological approach of exegesis of the Old and New Testaments — all these methods for gaining discernment will be used together as spades in the digging after enlightenment on how shame affects church attendance. Some reasons for using all these methods together are stated below:

Forces integration of thought: A multi-disciplinary approach is not whimsical or lightweight. The multi-disciplinary approach, using more than one method, forces integration of thought and insight. It avoids one-dimensional and shallow conclusions. According to Cook and Reichardt (1979), "... the logic of description and inference cuts across methods..."⁵ They make the point that qualitative and quantitative methods should be allowed to interact:

Feinberg (1977) tells of sending his graduate students to spend a couple of nights riding around in a patrol car so as to be better

able to design a quantitative evaluation of police activities. Similarly, many quantitative researchers venture into the field to 'get their hands dirty' and laboratory psychologists will sit through their own manipulations and carefully grill their respondents to find out what their behavioral responses mean.⁶

Used by professionals: The best proof that it is acceptable to mix methodologies is that it is currently being accepted in the professional journals. In fact, writers using one methodology are often found to quote from other sources using entirely different methodologies. Thus, in the Journal of Analytical Psychology, Peer Hultberg of Hamburg, Germany, a Jungian analyst, draws on anthropological studies of Eskimos in his analysis of how shame is hidden.⁷ David H. Demo, in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, says that the interview method is indeed a valid way of measuring and "is certainly warranted" as a methodology for studying self-esteem issues.⁸

Ethical considerations: Furthermore, in the study of the subject of shame, ethical considerations force the avoidance of normal dissertation techniques. One simply cannot do case study interviews of shamed church members the same way one might do interviews of some other aspect of church life. The element of being obliged ethically to avoid revealing relevant but embarrassing material means that a methodology is needed which approaches the subject from a variety of angles which are nonthreatening to the privacy of the group being studied.

The more ways in which this particular subject is approached, the better, in order to get around the handicap of the great necessity of total confidentiality. Consequently, this dissertation attempts to integrate several approaches to understanding the subject, because of the need for anonymity of the subjects and their churches.

The Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education was adhered to in the test taking procedure as much as possible, especially as it related to ethical questions.⁹ For example, each resident member who consented to be tested was informed of the general overall results of the testing in a letter after the tests had been collected and analyzed. A church committee approved the testing and the purpose of the testing, which was to understand better why chronic nonattenders do not attend. The entire resident membership, when asked to take the tests, responded very positively, as shown by a very high rate of response in returning the completed tests.

Case study is the primary method: The primary methodology of this work is the case study, because the case study method itself supports the idea of drawing on as many angles as possible in viewing a subject. Since the situations of the interviewees in the case study and participant observation must be drastically disguised in this case, the other methodologies (statistical measurement, questionnaires, intuitive insights from fiction in classical literature, inductive biblical exegesis, and analysis of historical figures) become just as valuable as five years of personal interaction with those studied.

Theology is the underlying framework: Finally, underlying the use of all the different methodologies are two premises: the theological premise that no understanding is possible apart from God,¹⁰ and the philosophical premise that there is only one truth about a given thing rather than several relative and conflicting truths. In this writer's belief, all methodologies can best be brought together within a theological framework which recognizes God as sovereign and recognizes truth as absolutely unified, grounded in Him.¹¹ Accordingly, the concluding analysis of the subject of shame is theological with a pastoral purpose, which is the cure of souls.

The theological section will attempt a synthesis of insight which gives appropriate weight to both secular and spiritual approaches, letting each inform the other. No attempt will be made to force secular insights into a theological mold. Good theology does not ignore or reject inductive reasoning, but rather capitalizes on it to achieve better insight. However, at the same time, for good science to be practical and productive for humans it must take into consideration spiritual realities for which scientific methods alone are inadequate to give knowledge. In this paper, science will be a helpful but subservient assistant to theology, the queen of the sciences.

Section III. The Value of This Study

Shame Hurts; Its Healing Helps

A study was done by Talland and Clark in 1954 in which it was shown that there was a high correlation between the helpfulness of a topic, i.e., its therapeutic value, and its disturbing qualities.¹² The topic of "shame and guilt" was rated as extremely upsetting, but at the same time it was rated as first in being most helpful. In other words, it was a sore subject, but resulted in the most healing when dealt with successfully. Shame causes great pain; and its healing causes great relief. Therefore shame deserves more study.

The Jewish Talmud says that humiliation is worse than physical pain; and shaming another in public is like shedding blood.¹³ Being shamed hurts! The main motivation for this dissertation is the "cure of souls": to heal the broken-hearted and reconcile the shamed, the embarrassed, the humiliated, the bitter, and the angry, in order to bring about true *koinonia*. In rural life, one offended person, who stops coming to church and perhaps ceases being an active

part of the community, can become a stumbling block to the *koinonia* and future growth and happiness of the church!

Rural people are related by kinship and lifetime association in a way that knits them so closely that one offended person simply cannot be overlooked, as can be done (perhaps) in a big church with much less immediate consequence. Shame has the interesting (and, for any church, dangerous) social dynamic of being able to generate shame in others: the shame of one can become a source of embarrassment to the whole church. As S. S. Tomkins put it, "The paradox about shame is that there is shame about shame."¹⁴ This single fact makes the study of shame important for pastoral ministry.

Shame is coming to be seen in professional circles of psychology as one of the most basic and potent of emotions. Whereas Freud gave enormous authority to the hypothesis that such central affects as aggression and anxiety were primal behind many of the basic human drives, in our own time shame is coming to be understood as still another central affect.¹⁵ It has the same primal power as sexuality itself to mold, or wound, a personality. It affects relationships profoundly. Therefore it is well deserving of study.

Systems analysis of the rural traditional form of organization will show that one offended person in the small rural church has a much greater impact than one offended person in the bureaucratically organized large city church. A relatively large percentage of United Methodist church members are in small, rural churches. In the small church every single member has great impact on the politics and the sociological and emotional health of the whole church: in the small church, every Indian is a chief.

The rural church that has an offended, hurt, embarrassed, or ashamed member and does not minister to that person will find that the church itself loses

its self-esteem — "shame begets shame." Where shame is causing people to stay away from church, there community has been broken, and the church is obligated to work to restore the broken member to fellowship before it can go on to enjoy worship again. As a pastor, this writer has lived with three southern rural charges over nearly fifteen years, and believes very strongly in the importance of protecting and restoring *koinonia* in small rural churches. The understanding of shame and how it can be alleviated is a means to that goal.

Organization of the Dissertation

The literature on the subject of shame will be reviewed in the next two chapters, chapter two and chapter three, looking at the fields of philosophy, anthropology, works of literature, sociology, and psychology. Chapter four establishes the details and background of the setting, including a survey of current attitudes on church attendance.

Next, taking chapters five, six, and seven, will be a section on observation of the phenomenon of shame in two small rural churches using the three major methods of observation in use today among professionals of various fields.¹⁶ Chapter five will use the case study method, chapter six will use statistical measurement, and chapter seven will use participant observation.

Chapter eight will reflect on the biblical basis for a theology of shame. Included in chapter eight will be a brief look at some historical Christian figures who have dealt with shame indirectly in their life's work. The dissertation will conclude with a ninth chapter on ways to heal shame, drawn both from secular and theological reflection and analysis.

CHAPTER TWO

The Literature: Studies of Shame, Humiliation, and Embarrassment in Professional Disciplines

Introduction

Since shame is a topic of interest in so many realms, this chapter is organized to present to the reader the contributions of the various professional disciplines. The contribution of each discipline will be summarized in its own separate section.

There will be a certain repetition of themes throughout the sections, for example the themes of social inhibition, feeling confused, self-centered feelings of being seen, and hiding or withdrawal. However, this repetition of themes is preferable to attempting some giant synthesis of all the sources. Instead, as the reader moves through the sections of this chapter, there should be a sense of coming at the themes from refreshing new angles.

The order of presentation will be from the general to the specific. First will be the section on philosophy; then anthropology; then works of literature; and finally, sociology and psychology, saving the best till last. The reason for combining sociology and psychology is that there is so much overlap. There is even a professional journal called the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, and another one called the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

Section I. Philosophy

Shame as Concern About the Opinions of Others

Going back as far as the time of Aristotle and Socrates, people have been concerned about the opinions that others might have of them, according to modern

philosopher John Deigh.¹⁶ For example, Crito had tried in vain to convince Socrates to escape and not to drink the hemlock. Crito says to Socrates, "I am ashamed, both on your account and on ours your friends; it will look as though we had played something like a coward's part all through this affair of yours."¹⁷ Deigh concludes that Crito means he feels ashamed, not because someone might think his aims are shoddy or that he is deficient in persuasive talent, but because someone might think he had a bad character. In other words, shame in this example has to do with the fear of incurring a low opinion from others.

Shame as Fear of a Threat

Deigh says that a major issue among philosophers through the ages is whether shame is due to grief and sorrow over a failure to achieve a goal or grief and sorrow over a loss, or whether shame is more a reaction to a threat. We see in the above example that Deigh concludes shame is more a reaction to a threat than a reaction to a failure to achieve an aim.

For definitions of shame as a type of grief or sorrow, see Hobbes¹⁸ and Descartes;¹⁹ for definitions of shame as a type of fear see Aquinas; it is also suggested in Plato's Euthyphro 12a-d1.²⁰ A modern proponent who Deigh says "appears to hold that shame is a kind of fear" is Havelock Ellis.²¹ Deigh concludes that when one feels a sense of grief, it is more likely that one has experienced a loss of self-esteem; but the experience of shame is more akin to fear. He concludes:

The idea that shame is a self-protective emotion brings together and explains two important features: first, that a liability to shame regulates conduct in that it inhibits one from doing certain things and, second, that experiences of shame are expressed by acts of concealment. The second is crucial. Covering one's face, covering up what one thinks is shameful, and hiding from others are, along with blushing, the most characteristic expressions of shame. Students of shame commonly note them. A quote from Darwin is representative, 'Under a keen sense of shame there is a strong desire for concealment.'²²

Here is found the opening notes of two major themes which will be found throughout the following sections: shame as an inhibitor of conduct and shame as expressed by acts of concealment or hiding from others.

Shame as Seeing Oneself Being Seen

The philosopher Nietzsche described the inhibiting feeling from shame as being related to the feeling of being seen:

That feeling: 'I am the center of the world!' occurs very intensely when one is suddenly attacked by disgrace. One stands there as if dumbfounded by the surf and feels blinded as though stared at by one big eye that looks at him and through him from all sides.²³

Describing this same sensation, Jean-Paul Sartre tells of the shame he felt from being seen looking into a keyhole: "all of a sudden I hear footsteps in the hall. Someone is looking at me! ... I am seen."²⁴ Sartre adds, concerning its intensely personal and inward-looking nature, "Consider shame. Its structure is intentional. It is a shameful apprehension of something and that something is me." And again: "I am ashamed of what I am. Shame therefore realises an intimate relation of myself to myself. Through shame I have discovered an aspect of my being."²⁵

Section II. Anthropology

Cross-cultural studies by Ekberg support the theory of psychologist Silvan Tomkins that there are universal facial expressions of emotion, and in particular, universal facial expressions for shame.²⁶ It will be seen in the next section, on works of fiction and nonfiction, that the very expressions of shame mentioned by Tomkins et. al. are found in the works of Nathaniel Hawthorne.

Anthropology approaches the subject of shame differently from other studies, as will be seen below:

Shame as "Playing Possum"

Anthropology, the study of different cultures, provides some of the most difficult material to integrate intellectually, yet some of the most delightful stories with truly profound meanings. For example, the Choctaw Indians of Mississippi have an explanation for how the opossum was shamed by the raccoon:

The story is about how Possum wanted a beautiful tail like Raccoon. Raccoon jokingly tells Possum how he got his pretty black stripes by wrapping his tail with hickory bark and singeing it in hot ashes. As a result of Possum doing as Raccoon told him, opossums today have no hair on their tails, travel at night because of embarrassment and 'play possum'.²⁷

The story is charming but also instructive as to what the Choctaws view as shameful: being fooled is cause for embarrassment. Also, the theme of hiding because of shame reappears: Possum now travels at night. The fact that Possum "plays possum," i.e., falls down and appears to be dead, shows that shame both causes confusion to the point of rendering one helpless, and causes one to pretend in order to avoid annihilation.

As a side note, this author has had personal experience with opossums. If the threat becomes physical, the opossum has very sharp teeth and knows how to use them. Instead of pretending to be dead, the opossum can react with vicious vigor. One night the author lassoed an opossum with a string through a hole in the bathroom closet leading under the house. The opossum was sniffing the kitty litter. The author barely made it to the front door with his hand intact. This further shows the astuteness of the Choctaws in choosing the opossum to illustrate shame; one could conclude from their story that shame is a reaction to a threat, and that it can manifest either as a hiding of one's true feelings or as a raging attack with survival at stake.

Shame as Being Like a Shrinking Plant

If a cultural example from the author's home state may be forgiven, one may even learn about shame from the names of plants. In the state of this author's birth, and in many southern states, there exists a tiny wildflower called by botanists the sensitive briar; but its common name is the shame plant. Whenever the leaves are touched, they withdraw and close in upon themselves. What a perfect picture of the emotions produced by shame!

Shame as On the Skin's Surface, or Deep Inside

Hultberg points out that there is the shame that serves the purpose of social adaptation, and the shame that protects the self and the integrity of the individual. Illustrating this from anthropology, Hultberg says,

An anonymous member of a tribe in New Guinea knows that shame may either be "shame on the skin" or "deep shame" (Heller 13). If, for instance, one is observed when urinating or having sexual intercourse one feels "shame on the skin"; but if one offends the ghosts of the forefathers one reacts with "deep shame". Shame is, in other words, either the feeling reaction to a wrong social attitude, or the emotional reaction to an offence against the inner system of values, which is connected with the self.²⁸

It is obvious from this example that even the most primitive people in the world can have quite clear and valuable understanding of the basic emotion of shame.

Shame as a Way to Win a Quarrel

There exist many societies in which shame or ridicule is the hardest punishment that can be inflicted on an individual. According to Jungian psychiatrist Peer Hultberg of Germany,

In certain Eskimo cultures, for example, a quarrel is often solved by so-called song duels, in which the adversaries sing mocking songs about one another. Contrary to our ideas of right and wrong the strongest, that is the wittiest, contestant wins and the loser can apparently feel so ridiculed that his life in the settlement becomes impossible. He has to retire to live alone, which in Eskimo society is almost equivalent to death (Hindsberger 14, Kleivan 18).²⁹

Shame Cultures and Guilt Cultures

Later, in the next chapter, it will be explained how Freud is primarily responsible for much of the modern mental confusion of shame and guilt. As a result of that confusion by Freud in the early 1900's, Ruth Benedict set forth the theory that there are shame cultures and guilt cultures.³⁰ Hultberg says that anthropologists still are debating this idea fiercely; however, although "it is impossible in practice to make a strict distinction between shame cultures and guilt cultures," nevertheless

...we can recognize as typical shame cultures the Nordic Viking culture, certain Eskimo societies, North-American Indian cultures, Japanese society before the Second World War, early Greek culture as reflected in the Homeric songs, and above all, in the Iliad, and in our Western-European / American societies....³¹

Perhaps the most challenging, and possibly damning, thing Hultberg says is that the Western-European / American societies have, over the last couple thousand years, developed from a guilt culture towards a shame culture:

A guilt culture is one in which authority is based on concepts like transgression and punishment, sin but also forgiveness, eternal salvation but also eternal damnation, a punishing God but also a merciful God. In a shame culture the highest goal is not a clear conscience but a good reputation among people. Identification and not submission is then the most important factor ... In a shame culture there are no firm concepts of good and evil in the metaphysical sense of the words; instead there are absolute ideas of honour and disgrace, renown and contemptibility, respect and ridicule.³²

It used to be that Amero-European culture was a guilt culture, says Hultberg:

Bourgeois culture, with its strong connections with Protestantism and Puritanism, paid little attention to shame. It seemed a hindrance to efficiency....Guilt, on the other hand, was seen as an essential factor in society because it emphasized the role of conscience and the absolute distinction between right and wrong; it kept people rooted in bourgeois culture, by obliging them to render account to society for themselves and for their deeds.³³

The fundamental reason for the switch from guilt to shame culture, Hultberg says, is that Christianity is in decline and "the so-called super-ego values are held increasingly in doubt. The outcome is that shame begins to dominate at the expense of guilt."³⁴ In other words, western society is now rapidly moving into becoming a shame culture, in which hero worship is replacing veneration of right over wrong, as Christianity fails.

Hultberg is only partly right. Christianity is not failing, but spreading in Russia and China and elsewhere. Hultberg may have explained, however, the current seeming decline of the gospel in European and North American cultures, while it is still spreading among more guilt-oriented cultures. The Catholicism of Latin American countries has definitely created and sustained a guilt culture, but an overburdened one; the burgeoning Pentecostal movement, which with its intense contact with the Holy Spirit frees the individual from the burdens of the confessional, is nevertheless extremely works-oriented in this writer's personal experience of four years in Colombia, South America.

Is America becoming more a shame culture?: In the United States, people like tennis star Andre Agassi are telling us that "style is everything," which sounds suspiciously like something from a culture in which a good reputation is more important than a good conscience. In fact, the U.S.A. has become reputation crazy. The names roll off the tongue: Michael Jordan, Johnny Carson, Phil Collins, Madonna, George Bush, Arnold Swartzenegger...

Publishers of Vacation Bible School literature and Sunday School literature are moving in the direction of "hero-izing" the good Bible characters and "villain-izing" the bad ones. Serial killers, who make Jack the Ripper look like a piker, seek fame with no apparent concern for feelings of guilt.

What if the American preoccupation with personalities is indeed evidence of a new thing, a shift from a guilt culture to a shame culture? If true, Hultberg's claim makes it all the more imperative for presenters of the gospel in the United States to understand the nature of a shame culture and to find those aspects of the gospel which answer the questions of the shame-bound soul.

Identity over behavior: Everywhere, reputation seems more important than right and wrong. The move toward a shame culture would explain all this: in a shame culture, the search for an admirable and acceptable "popular" identity takes precedence over the search for correct behavior.

A flaw in the theory: The reality is not a simplistic either-or model as Ruth Benedict proposed; rather the truth is that issues of shame and guilt are much more intertwined and complicated than previously supposed. (For example, depending upon definitions, each may be said to generate the other.)

It will be seen in chapter eight how Christianity relates very clearly to questions of shame. In fact, the Bible treats the deep questions about shame while remaining clear on questions of guilt at the same time. Also, in the next chapter, in the psychological / sociological section, it will be shown how modern theory points to deeper insights than are available in the Freudian model of shame, upon which the idea of a shame culture versus a guilt culture is based.

One need only go back as far as the Puritans to see the flaw in assuming American culture to be all guilt-oriented. David Ausubel says,

The presence of the stock, the pillory, and the ducking stool in the public market place offers eloquent refutation to the statement [by Ruth Benedict] that 'the early Puritans who settled in the United States tried to base their whole morality on guilt.'³

Obviously, the stock, pillory, and ducking stool were devices for shaming. Thus, it cannot be said that Puritan society was a guilt culture, since they so

clearly were aware of and were utilizing the shame of misbehavers to enforce the norm. Suffice it here to conclude that it is possible for a culture to be both shame-based and guilt-based in its motivations, simultaneously.

Section III. Works of Literature

Introduction

For the moment, dropping back from the intense theories and the large cultural overview of the previous section on anthropology, the reader is now invited to relax, sit back, and think more on the personal level. This section is about authors and their works. It will be shown in this section how the descriptive writing in a good work of fiction — or non-fiction — can serve as a "phenomenology of shame."

A good author can give a perspective on shame closer to the actual emotional experience of feeling shame itself. Since reading involves fantasizing, the involvement of oneself in the reading experience can be very profound. Various descriptions of shame will now be shown in works of literature:

Shame Felt on the Face

Nathaniel Hawthorne: Going back to the theme of the face, Hester Prynne, accused of adultery in Hawthorne's The Scarlet Letter, stood publicly shamed with a face "turning pale as death."³⁶ Hawthorne says of her that there was no way for her to hide her face:

"There can be ... no outrage more flagrant than to forbid the culprit to hide his face for shame; as it was the essence of this punishment to do ... under the heavy weight of a thousand unrelenting eyes."³⁷

Hester also manifested the three characteristic facial defenses against shame, first identified by Silvan Tomkins and listed by Gershen Kaufman (about whom

more will be heard in the concluding section), namely: the frozen face, where the face is kept rigid as a mask; the head-back look, jutting the chin forward; and the look of contempt, or sneer.³⁸

Joseph Conrad: In Joseph Conrad's Lord Jim, the main character was at the beginning prosecuted for a terrible crime. Completely aside from his guilt, he felt the "shame that made you burn" upon his face when "the presiding magistrate, clean shaved and impassible, looked at him deadly pale" with "the attentive eyes whose glance stabbed." Jim was surrounded by "many eyes ... looking at him out of dark faces, out of white faces, out of red faces, out of faces attentive, spellbound...." They were spellbound by his dreadful crime of having let a whole boatload of refugees perish unnecessarily through his carelessness.³⁹ Lord Jim specifically felt the shame burning on his face.

John Keats: John Keats, the poet, also had thoughts about blushing. Hultberg says that

The exceedingly painful nature of shame was described in a letter written by Keats in 1818: 'The most unhappy hours in our lives are those in which we recollect times past to our own blushing — If we are immortal that must be the Hell.'⁴⁰

Andre Gide: Finally, there is a funny-sad example from Andre Gide's novel, Lafcadio's Adventures in which a young French girl named Arnica Péterat discovered, at age ten, that her name had a ridiculous and shameful connotation which in English might be roughly translated "Miss Fartwell." Gide describes how she felt upon this sudden terrible revelation:

Arnica Péterat — guileless and helpless — had never until that moment suspected that there might be anything laughable in her name; on her first day at school its ridicule came upon her as a sudden revelation; she bowed her head, like some sluggish waterweed, to the jeers that flowed over her; she turned red; she turned pale; she wept.⁴¹

Emotional Confusion and Disorientation

Nathaniel Hawthorne: Once again Hester Prynne, the adulteress of The Scarlet Letter, was so affected by being publicly shamed that she did not recognize her own husband from Europe who stood on the edge of the town square and looked her right in the eye.⁴² Hester Prynne "kept her place upon the pedestal of shame with glazed eyes, and an air of weary indifference."⁴³ Immediately following this, she fainted.

Damaged Reputation

William Shakespeare: Hamlet says as he lies dying, the whole world aware of his family's tragic and shameful follies, "O God, Horatio, what a wounded name!"⁴⁴ The idea that there is no hiding a damaged reputation comes out again in King Lear: "Time shall unfold what plighted cunning hides; who covers faults, at last shame them derides."⁴⁵

Shame at the Shame of Another

Dostoevski: Shame at the shame of another is called by the psychologists empathic shame. Dostoevski emphasizes the high human qualities of Prince Myshkin in The Idiot, says Hultberg,

by showing his acutely sensitive and empathic shame reactions. They prove that he is precisely not an idiot but a human being on the highest step of inner development or, as we Jungians would say, the highest level of individuation. ... Dostoevski ... shows in his novel how shame can be the emotional expression of a person who, to a very high degree, is in harmony with himself and at the same time able to react on his surroundings with greatest sensitivity and empathy...openness and relatedness towards the self and towards fellow human beings.⁴⁶

Shame Leading to Suicide

Virginia Woolf: Woolf probably committed suicide because of fear of the possible humiliation of a public rejection of her latest novel. In her diary

of 1937, four years before she drowned herself shortly after finishing her novel Between the Acts, she wrote:

I wish I could write out my sensations at this moment. They are so peculiar and so unpleasant...As if something cold and horrible — a roar of laughter at my expense were about to happen. And I am powerless to ward it off: I have no protection. And this anxiety and nothingness surround me with a vacuum....And I want to burst into tears, but have nothing to cry for. Then a great restlessness seizes me. I think I could walk it off — walk and walk till I am asleep....And I know that I must go on doing this dance on hot bricks till I die...I'm going to be beaten, I'm going to be laughed at, I'm going to be held up to scorn and ridicule....

Shame Conquered by Love

William Shakespeare: In Romeo and Juliet, the nurse says, "Have you no modesty, no maiden shame?" But in fact, according to Kurt Reizler,

Each of her words is full of 'modesty and maiden shame.' Obviously our judgment of whether an attitude is shameless or not depends on the presence or absence of a mysterious something called 'love,' whatever it may be.⁴⁸

This is the first hint, in the dissertation, of what is to come in the concluding chapter, namely that love heals shame.

Eldridge Cleaver: Perhaps the most moving passage this writer ever read upon the theme of love conquering shame is found in Eldridge Cleaver's heart-rending letter "To All Black Women, From All Black Men." The Negro people, shamed profoundly by slavery in the South, will in this writer's opinion never be entirely free until they find their identity, as Cleaver does, in love. The letter is here quoted in its entirety, with typography as close as possible to the original:

Queen-Mother-Daughter of Africa
Sister of My Soul
Black Bride of My Passion
My Eternal Love

I greet you, my Queen, not in the obsequious whine of a cringing Slave to which you have become accustomed, neither do I greet

you in the new voice, the unctuous supplications of the sleek Black Bourgeois, not the bullying bellow of the rude Free Slave — but in my own voice do I greet you, the voice of the Black Man. And although I greet you anew, my greeting is not new, but as old as the Sun, Moon, and Stars. And rather than mark a new beginning, my greeting signifies only my Return.

I have Returned from the dead. I speak to you now from the Here And Now. I was dead for four hundred years. For four hundred years you have been a woman alone, bereft of her man, a manless woman. For four hundred years I was neither your man nor my own man. The white man stood between us, over us, around us. The white man was your man and my man. Do not pass lightly over this truth, my Queen, for even though the fact of it has burned into the marrow of our bones and diluted our blood, we must bring it to the surface of the mind, into the realm of knowing, glue our gaze upon it and stare at it as at a coiled serpent in a baby's playpen or the fresh flowers on a mother's grave. It is to be pondered and realized in the heart, for the heel of the white man's boot is our point of departure, our point of Resolve and Return — the bloodstained pivot of our future. (But I would ask you to recall, that before we could come up from slavery, we had to be pulled down from our throne.)

Across the naked abyss of negated masculinity, of four hundred years minus my Balls, we face each other today, my Queen. I feel a deep, terrifying hurt, the pain of humiliation of the vanquished warrior. The shame of the fleet-footed sprinter who stumbles at the start of the race. I feel unjustified. I can't bear to look into your eyes. Don't you know (surely you must have noticed by now: four hundred years!) that for four hundred years I have been unable to look squarely into your eyes? I tremble inside each time you look at me. I can feel . . . in the ray of your eye, from a deep hiding place, a long-kept secret you harbor. That is the unadorned truth. Not that I would have felt justified, under the circumstances, in taking such liberties with you, but I want you to know that I feared to look into your eyes because I knew I would find reflected there a merciless Indictment of my impotence and a compelling challenge to redeem my conquered manhood.

My Queen, it is hard for me to tell you what is in my heart for you today — what is in the heart of all my black brothers for you and all your black sisters — and I fear I will fail unless you reach out to me, tune in on me with the antenna of your love, the sacred love in ultimate degree which you were unable to give me because I, being dead, was unworthy to receive it; that perfect, radical love of black on which our Fathers thrived. *Let me drink from the river of your love at its source, let the lines of force of your love seize my soul by its core and heal the wound of my Castration, let my convex exile end its haunted Odyssey in your concave essence which receives that it may give.* Flower of Africa, it is only through the liberating power of your re-love that my manhood can be redeemed. For it is in your eyes, before you, that my need is to be justified. Only, only, only you and only you can condemn or set me free.

Be convinced, Sable Sister, that the past is no forbidden vista upon which we dare not look, out of a phantom fear of being, as the wife of Lot, turned into pillars of salt. Rather the past is an omniscient mirror: we gaze and see reflected there ourselves and each other — what we used to be, what we are today, how we got this way, and what we are becoming. To decline to look into the Mirror of Then, my heart, is to refuse to view the face of Now.

I have died the ninth death of the cat, have seen Satan face to face and turned my back on God, have dined in the Swine's Trough, and descended to the uttermost echelon of the Pit, have entered the Den and seized my Balls from the teeth of a roaring lion!

Black Beauty, in impotent silence I listened, as if to a symphony of sorrows, to your screams for help, anguished pleas of terror that echo still throughout the Universe and through the mind, a million scattered screams across the painful years that merged into a single sound of pain to haunt and bleed the soul, a white-hot sound to char the brain and blow the fuse of thought, a sound of fangs and teeth sharp to eat the heart, a sound of moving fire, a sound of frozen heat, a sound of licking flames, a fiery-fiery sound, a sound of fire to burn the steel out of my Balls, a sound of Blue fire, a Bluesy sound, the sound of dying, the sound of my woman in pain, *the sound of my woman's pain, THE SOUND OF MY WOMAN CALLING ME, ME, I HEARD HER CALL FOR HELP, I HEARD THAT MOURNFUL SOUND BUT HUNG MY HEAD AND FAILED TO HEED IT, I HEARD MY WOMAN'S CRY, I HEARD MY WOMAN'S SCREAM, I HEARD MY WOMAN BEG THE BEAST FOR MERCY, I HEARD HER BEG FOR ME, I HEARD MY WOMAN BEG THE BEAST FOR MERCY FOR ME, I HEARD MY WOMAN DIE, I HEARD THE SOUND OF HER DEATH, A SNAPPING SOUND, A BREAKING SOUND, A SOUND THAT SOUNDED FINAL, THE LAST SOUND, THE ULTIMATE SOUND, THE SOUND OF DEATH, ME, I HEARD, I HEAR IT EVERY DAY, I HEAR HER NOW . . . I HEAR YOU NOW . . . I HEAR YOU. . . .* I heard you then . . . your scream came like a searing bolt of lightning that blazed a white streak down my black back. In a cowardly stupor, with a palpitating heart and quivering knees, I watched the Slaver's lash of death slash through the opposing air and bite with teeth of fire into your delicate flesh, the black and tender flesh of African Motherhood, forcing the startled Life untimely from your torn and outraged womb, the sacred womb that cradled primal man, the womb that incubated Ethiopia and populated Nubia and gave forth Pharaohs unto Egypt, the womb that painted the Congo black and mothered Zulu, the womb of Mero, the womb of the Nile, of the Niger, the womb of Songhay, of Mali, of Ghana, the womb that felt the might of Chaka before he saw the Sun, the Holy Womb, the womb that knew the future form of Jomo Kenyatta, the womb of Mau, the womb of the blacks, the womb that nurtured Toussaint Louverture, that warmed Nat Turner, and Gabriel Prosser, and Denmark Vesey, the black womb that surrendered up in tears that nameless and endless chain of Africa's Cream, the Black Cream of the Earth, that nameless and endless black chain that sank in heavy groans into oblivion in the great abyss, the womb that received and nourished and held firm the seed and gave back Sojourner Truth, and Sister

Tubman, and Rosa Parks, and Bird, and Richard Wright, and your other works of art who wore and wear such names as Marcus Garvey and Du-Bois and Kwame Nkrumah and Paul Robeson and Malcolm X and Robert Williams, and the one you bore in pain and called Elijah Muhammad, but most of all that nameless one they tore out of your womb in a flood of murdered blood that splashed upon and seeped into the mud. And Patrice Lumumba, and Emmett Till, and Mack Parker.

Oh, My Soul! I became a sniveling craven, a funky punk, a vile, groveling bootlicker, with my will to oppose petrified by a cosmic fear of the Slavemaster. Instead of inciting the Slaves to rebellion with eloquent oratory, I soothed their hurt and eloquently sang the Blues! Instead of hurling my life with contempt into the face of my Tormentor, I *shed your precious blood!* When Nat Turner sought to free me from my Fear, my Fear delivered him up unto the Butcher — a martyred monument to my Emasculation. My spirit was unwilling and my flesh was weak. Ah, eternal ignominy!

I, the Black Eunuch, divested of my Balls, walked the earth with my mind locked in Cold Storage. I would kill a black man or woman quicker than I'd smash a fly, while for the white man I would pick a thousand pounds of cotton a day. What profit is there in the blind, frenzied efforts of the (Guilty!) Black Eunuchs (Justifiers!) who hide their wounds and scorn the truth to mitigate their culpability through the pallid sophistry of postulating a Universal Democracy of Cowards, pointing out that in history no one can hide, that if not at one time then surely at another the iron heel of the Conqueror has ground into the mud the Balls of Everyman? Memories of yesterday will not assuage the torrents of blood that flow today from my crotch. Yes, History could pass for a scarlet text, its jot and tittle graven red in human blood. More armies than shown in the books have planted flags on foreign soil leaving Castration in their wake. But no Slave should die a natural death. There is a point where Caution ends and Cowardice begins. Give me a bullet through the brain from the gun of the beleaguered oppressor on the night of siege. Why is there dancing and singing in the Slave Quarters? A Slave who dies of natural causes cannot balance two dead flies in the Scales of Eternity. Such a one deserves rather to be pitied than mourned.

Black woman, without asking how, just say that we survived our forced march and travail through the Valley of Slavery, Suffering and Death — there, that Valley there beneath us hidden by that drifting mist. Ah, what sights and sounds and pain lie beneath that mist! And we had thought that our hard climb out of that cruel valley led to some cool, green and peaceful, sunlit place — but it's all jungle here, a wild and savage wilderness that's overrun with ruins.

But put on your crown, my Queen, and we will build a New City on these ruins.⁴⁹

What makes this passage all the more moving is the rarity of its honesty in facing shame issues concerning race. Much of modern black art, drama, and

literature deals with shame issues, but very few do so as honestly as Cleaver. The same is true for Jewish literature. Only The Diary of Anne Frank is known to the author of this dissertation as a work of the same level of openness.

Shame as a Source of Humor

Shame is a fundamental resource for humorists. Embarrassing incidents, from the slippery banana peel pratfalls of the Three Stooges to the stories of Lake Wobegon by Garrison Keillor, underlie much of modern humor. The terror of being humiliated is the working basis for much humor on television sitcoms. The very fact that so much of both British and American humor revolves around shame issues ought to serve as a sign of the importance of shame in this culture. If the reader will forgive a non-literary allusion here, a radio monologue by Garrison Keillor of American Public Radio fame will illustrate:⁵⁰

Garrison Keillor: In a monologue first delivered in 1990, "1937 Chevy Septic Tank," Keillor relates a shame-based incident in the fictional town of Lake Wobegon, Minnesota. He tells how Karl Krepsbach accidentally meets his beautiful daughter Karla in a most embarrassing manner. Karl is using a tractor pulling a flatbed trailer to tote off to the Wobegon town dump an abused 1937 Chevy, which had been converted into a septic tank for his parent's house but which had lately ceased to function for hygiene due to rusting out.

Karl arrives in town on the tractor, pulling the Chevy on the trailer, nauseated by the horrible smell of his questionable family heirloom, which is still about half-loaded with its original cargo, at the exact moment that Karla, just elected high school beauty queen, is starring in the annual town parade just behind the Lake Wobegon high school marching band. Karla is perched high atop a Sherman tank and surrounded by an honor guard of National Guardsmen.

In Keillor's story, Karl, with the Chevy septic tank, sees the parade too late and skids through the scattering band to meet head on with the other tank — the Sherman tank. Karla screams at her father, "How could you do this to me?" Though Karl cannot hear her for the laughter of the crowd, he gets the message. It takes him twenty-nine tries to turn around ... and he then leads the parade. The entire story is predicated on embarrassment and humiliation, which makes for a most hilarious situation indeed due to the intensity of the feelings generated by the public embarrassment of Karl and his daughter Karla.

CHAPTER THREE

The Professional Literature, Continued:

Psychology and Sociology

Introduction

An important but neglected topic: Shame is a primary source of human alienation and emotional suffering. It was C. S. Lewis who said,

I sometimes think that shame, mere awkward, senseless shame, does as much towards preventing good acts and straightforward happiness as any of our vices can do.⁵¹

Shame is both prevalent and potent in our society as a negative motivator. Yet, because it is embarrassing to deal with, it has been overlooked! In a paper presented in 1990 at an international convention for psychological studies, Nancy Stiehler-Thurston, a Fuller Theological Seminary Psy. D. candidate from Central Michigan University, said,

While shame has recently grown as an area of interest and investigation for social scientists, the impact of shame continues to be regrettably underrepresented in the literature on human motivation, behavior assessment and clinical treatment.

... It is likely that shame has been overlooked as an area of study due to its very nature: shame is an intensely aversive feeling state that motivates strong avoidance responses. ... Moreover, since even observing another person's shame almost invariably activates the observer's own shame feelings and memories, social scientists have had a whole array of understandable incentives to avoid the study of shame.⁵²

The importance of shame in current research cannot reasonably be denied. In fact, without a doubt the subject of shame is taking more and more of a center stage in the world of clinical psychology, sociology, and related fields.

Psychology: None of the standard reference works listing approved and validated psychological tests had a single test to measure shame-proneness until 1989. The word "shame" does not even appear in indexes of reference books for

psychological tests prior to 1989. The word "shame" appears more and more often, since about 1970, in the journals of clinical psychological and sociological writings. Yet this is changing. Shame is a concept and a construct that is catching on. Much more has been written about it since 1985, as will be seen just ahead.

Sociology: Sociologists are most interested in the subject of shame as it affects social groups. Sociologists inquire how shame affects people experiencing racial or ethnic prejudice. Sociologists explore how shame issues affect members of dysfunctional families related to the justice system — for example, sociologists look at cases of incest. Sociologists investigate shame issues in connection with problems in education — in other words, how shame avoidance affects learning in the classroom. Finally, sociologists work with shame issues in the treatment of alcoholics and their "alcohostages".

Alcoholics Anonymous has produced very concrete and practical sources of help for dealing with victims of traumatic, toxic shame. Most of the helpful work by sociologists on alcoholism revolves in one way or another around the A. A. organization, which somehow (with God's help) stumbled on something that works. Books for professional psychologists and sociologists dealing with alcoholic families are a major source of input for chapter nine of this work, on healing shame.

Surveys of shame literature: One of the best short surveys of the development of shame theory is written by three psychiatrists, Severino, McNutt, and Feder, in an article entitled "Shame and the Development of Autonomy."⁵³ Within this article, "three surveys of the metapsychological and clinical literature have been published (Wurmser, 1981; Kinston, 1983; Morrison, 1983)."⁵⁴ Wurmser's survey is in chapter seven of his book, begins with Freud, ends with Kohut, and

is written for psychiatrists primarily. Morrison's article also begins with Freud and ends with Kohut, but makes clear how the theories of Freud were inadequate.

Healthy versus unhealthy shame: Lest there be confusion, let it be said at the outset that the following study of the development of the concept of shame refers primarily to development of understanding about unhealthy, and not healthy, shame. The reader is asked to assume throughout this dissertation that appearances of the word shame by itself alone refer always to dysfunctional or unhealthy shame.

Perhaps the reader had begun to wonder if there is any sense in which shame can be considered positive. There is definitely such a thing as healthy shame. The first chapter spoke of the shame spectrum, with modesty at the left as a word which aptly described the mildest form of shame. The following will touch lightly on healthy shame, and then toxic shame, after which will come a study of the development of shame theory.

Healthy shame: Shame can have positive adaptive functions in individuals and their family systems.⁵⁵ Positive or healthy shame — a concept commonly referred to in psychological literature — can teach moral boundaries.⁵⁶ Healthy shame as defined by John Bradshaw can also prevent arrogance or self-aggrandizement, and can even be a source of creativity, learning, and spirituality.⁵⁷ Normal levels of embarrassment serve many socializing functions, such as conformity, self-control, poise, self-honesty, a means to test newcomers, and even negative sanctions against persons assuming too much social power.⁵⁸

Toxic shame: When it is no more than a transitory affect in a person with a firm identity, which the person can handle without defensive reactions, shame can be healthy; but there is a type of shaming behavior which can be devastating

to a developing personality and which produces within that person what Bradshaw calls toxic shame.⁵⁹ This involves a distortion or dysfunction of one's personal identity, having an intensely and chronically negative effect on the development of that person.

Shame-proneness: One of the effects of toxic shame is shame-proneness, i.e. interpreting every shaming or embarrassing incident as further proof of one's basic worthlessness, and being extremely likely to experience shame in any given situation because of emotional memory triggers within.⁶⁰ Other names for shame-proneness are shame-deficiency and being shame-based.⁶¹ Shame-proneness is behind much depression, and can even lead to split personality as a means of escaping the badness of one's self-concept or identity.⁶²

Historical Development of Shame Theory

The increasing body of scientific psychological studies focused on shame, and sociological studies focused on embarrassment and humiliation is due primarily to a development in the psychoanalytic understanding of the nature of shame over the past 90 years, beginning with Sigmund Freud. Without taking a look at that development, the reader will be in the dark about the true meaning of the term shame as it is currently used. The clearest and briefest presentation of a history of the development of shame theory is by Gershen Kaufman, in his book The Psychology of Shame,⁶³ which provided the bones for the historical summary of shame theory below.

Sigmund Freud: (contribution roughly in the 1910's through the 1930's) Sigmund Freud focused on guilt because of a drive theory which by modern standards was primitive. Freud developed the theory of drives, in which the sex drive was a central feature and in which the libido strove against the super-ego.⁶⁴ Freud viewed shame as more of a spin-off from guilt, a "reaction to for-

bidden libidinal wishes" and his mistake was in "never clearly differentiating it from the guilt resulting from overstepping the sexual taboo."⁶⁵ Thus, by considering shame to be primarily a type of "resistance or defence phenomena" against guilt from the sex drive,⁶⁶ Freud was responsible for the confusion of shame and guilt over the next thirty years or so. He stressed the punitive aspects of his concept of the superego, and according to Morrison, this "postponed further elaboration of shame."⁶⁷

Freud also considered shame "to be a feminine characteristic par excellence," which he said "has as its purpose, we believe, concealment of genital deficiency."⁶⁸ This idea had to be overcome before the concept of shame could develop into its modern place as a central aspect of the drive to form identity.

Alfred Adler: (contribution roughly in the 1930's) An Austrian psychiatrist, Alfred Adler developed the concept of the inferiority complex, which was one of the first attempts to give shame a more central role in personality development.⁶⁹ What is especially significant about Adler is that he saw the need to concentrate on the development of human personality, which has become in modern times the main focus of progress in psychiatry.

Adler recognized the importance of shame in human personality development. For Adler, according to psychiatrist Peer Hultberg, "Shame is a product of the feeling of relatedness and as such impossible to exclude from the life of the human soul. Human society would be impossible without this affect."⁷⁰

Karen Horney: (contribution roughly in the 1950's) Karen Horney did not accord shame the status of a central construct, but she did relate shame directly to a construct which she did place as central: pride. She said, "The two typical reactions to hurt pride are shame and humiliation."⁷¹ Pride is viewed by her as the enemy of another central construct, love. Pride is linked with

self-hate and self-contempt, resulting in a person being controlled by a "tyranny of the shoulds." Both self-hate and self-contempt are seen today as being the result of the malformation of personality development, and today would be related to the construct of shame.

G. Piers and M. B. Singer: (contribution roughly in the 1950's) By elaborating Freud's concept of the superego, Piers and Singer clarified the difference between guilt and shame.⁷² They said that shame arises from tension between the ego and the ego-ideal, whereas guilt arises from tension between the ego and the superego.⁷³ Thus, guilt accompanies transgression and fears the threat of punishment, while shame accompanies failure and fears the threat of abandonment. This established clearly the difference between guilt and shame.

Erik Erikson: (contribution roughly in the 1950's) Erikson, in his classic work Childhood and Society, places shame in the second of eight stages, or identity crises, that span the life cycle.⁷⁴ Following Adler in placing emphasis on human personality development, Erikson said that the genesis of shame was not in the sex drive but in toilet training around the eighteenth month of life. A successful outcome of that stage would be that the child would develop autonomy while overcoming shame and doubt. Severino, McNutt, and Feder remark about this process that "With this basic sense of trust, the child had an inner sense of goodness from which autonomy developed; without the trust, there was an inner sense of badness resulting in shame."⁷⁵ Kaufman says of Erikson that all the remaining six stages of Erikson have negative poles which are an elaboration of the shame concept as it is now understood:

Consider the poles of each identity crisis more closely: basic trust versus basic mistrust, autonomy versus shame and doubt, initiative versus guilt, industry versus inferiority, identity versus role confusion, intimacy versus isolation, generativity versus stagnation, ego integrity versus despair. The affect most critical to the

development of mistrust, guilt, inferiority, isolation, and so on, is shame.⁷⁶

Helen M. Lynd: (contribution in 1958) Erikson's work came out in 1950. In 1958, Helen M. Lynd published a major work entitled On Shame and the Search for Identity which further built on the study of the human drive for identity and the study of human personality development as two major thrusts in psychology.⁷⁷ According to Kaufman, Lynd understood the shame experience to be a central part of the individual's search for identity.

Helen Block Lewis: Helen Lewis (contributions in 1971, 1981, 1987a, 1987b) explored guilt, shame, the superego, and identification in her classic work, Shame and Guilt in Neurosis, published in 1971.⁷⁸ Kaufman says of her that "She views guilt and shame as different, though equally advanced superego functions (states) that develop along different routes of identification" and "have a common source in internalized aggression."⁷⁹ Lewis is important for developing a detailed phenomenology of shame and guilt in neurosis, clearly differentiating the two:

The proximal stimulus to shame is thus deficiency of the self; while the proximal stimulus of guilt is some action (omission) by the self, which by implication is able. Shame thus feels involuntary; guilt feels as if it were more voluntary.⁸⁰

Lewis also developed the concept of "field dependence," referring to the fact that "people differ in their capacity to perceive objects which must be disembedded from context";⁸¹ thus, persons who are field-dependent are less able to direct their own lives, are more dependent on the opinions of others, are more likely to be women, are more likely to experience depression, and are more susceptible to shame.⁸²

A highly significant development from Lewis is the centrality of a new concept, the self concept. The concept of the self, which is "an entity more

global and less circumscribed" than Freud's id, ego, and superego,⁸³ was developed out of Piers' conceptualization of shame, according to Morrison, who gives in only a few words an entire history of the development of the theory of the self:

... Freud came late to the 'self', failing to clearly differentiate it from ego and ego ideal. Such a clarification in Freudian theory had to await Hartmann (1950) and Jacobson (1954). However, the self concept is central to Lewis' understanding of shame. According to her, 'The self is, first of all, the experiential registration of the person's activities as his own' (Lewis, p. 30). Shame, according to Lewis, is about the whole self, and its failure to live up to an ideal....⁸⁴

Leon Wurmser: Leon Wurmser (contribution in 1981) began to distinguish shame into different aspects.⁸⁵ He differentiated shame affect, the feeling of shame; shame anxiety, the fear of shame; and shame attitude, the approach to life in which a person views everything through shame-colored glasses.⁸⁶ At this point in history, according to Kaufman, "Though previously neglected and minimized, shame has finally moved center stage," but not until Silvan Tomkins developed a theory of emotion did shame finally come completely into focus.⁸⁷

Silvan Tomkins: Silvan Tomkins (contributions in 1962, 1963, 1982, 1984, 1987a) has presented over the past 30 years the theory that emotions are much more central to human personality than previously supposed. Tomkins' basic idea is that emotions are not, as Freud thought, mere symptoms; not merely a consequence of inner tensions between id, ego, and superego. Rather, emotions are themselves part of the human drive or motivation to form an identity, which is the most basic of all drives. Kaufman says, "In Tomkins' view, the primary blueprints for cognition, decision, and action are provided by the affect system."⁸⁸

Since, according to Tomkins, emotion is "the primary innate biological motivating mechanism, more urgent than drive deprivation and pleasure, and more

urgent even than physical pain," the result is that "Without its amplification, nothing else matters, and with its amplification anything can matter."⁸⁸

Tomkins, using laboratory experiments, has concluded that all emotion is experienced first on the face, and not in the viscera as is popularly believed. He has differentiated three positive and six negative basic or innate affects, or emotions, that will show on the face:

- (1) interest-excitement: eyebrows down, track, look, listen
- (2) enjoyment-joy: smile, lips widened up and out
- (3) surprise-startle: eyebrows up, eye blink
- (4) distress-anguish: cry, arched eyebrows, mouth down, tears, rhythmic sobbing
- (5) fear-terror: eyes frozen open, pale, cold, sweaty, facial trembling, hair erect
- (6) anger-rage: frown, clenched jaw, red face
- (7) shame-humiliation: eyes down, head down
- (8) dissimell: upper lip raised
- (9) disgust: lower lip lowered and protruded

If Tomkins is correct, shame is not just another emotion but a primary emotion. And it is therefore, as a primary emotion, a primary force in how human "cognition, decision, and action" is formed. Tomkins says, "... shame strikes deepest into the heart of man. While terror and distress hurt, ... shame is felt as an inner torment, a sickness of the soul."⁸⁹

Gershen Kaufman: Kaufman (contributions in 1974a, 1974b, 1983a, 1983b, 1984a, 1984b, 1985, 1986, 1987, 1989) is the primary or most advanced theoretical source for several of the latest books on shame (John Bradshaw, Eunice Cavanaugh, James Harper and Margaret Hoopes, and Ronald and Patricia Potter-Efron).⁹¹ Kaufman, a student of Professor Silvan Tomkins, believes that shame is the result when the drive to develop identity and self-concept is damaged through shame. Since this drive to self-identity is just as basic as any other drive such as survival, hunger, and sex, the dysfunction of it through shame can

be horribly self-destructive, because "No other affect is more central to the development of identity."⁸²

Although adults can also develop dysfunctional or unhealthy shame, the primary source of the development of injurious shame is during childhood, through the behavior of the person's family system. Professor Kaufman says, "the affects of disgust and contempt (anger plus dissmell) communicate complete rejection of the offensive, disgusting child." By overtly withdrawing love and prolonging the withdrawal unreasonably, a parent introduces unhealthy shame into the life of the child.⁸³ This can happen through such messages as "shame on you," "you are embarrassing me," "I am disappointed in you"; and through disparagement, humiliation, merciless teasing, unrealistic performance expectations, transferring blame unfairly, and attitudes of contempt and rejection, which give the message, in its extreme form, "you are worthless, no good, and bad and deserve to be abandoned or annihilated."

In addition, shame can come from failing to fulfill such central cultural scripts as competition for success, being independent and self-sufficient, and being popular and conforming — especially during adolescence.⁸⁴ Dysfunctional shame deforms personality and leads to self-destructive activities, such as sexual obsession, alcoholism, and mental problems such as schizophrenia and paranoia.

How Shame Is Internalized

Shame binds: A person can be shamed, Kaufman says, through three principal sources of shame internalization: the emotions, the drives, and interpersonal needs.⁸⁵ When a person is shamed in any one of these, then that person is described as ~~shame-bound~~. There can be affect-shame binds, for example when a

child is upset and cries and the parent, rejecting the child's emotion as bad, says "Don't cry or I'll give you something to cry about!"

Second, there can be drive-shame binds, for example when a child is molested sexually, thus binding up the sex drive in shame. A kinesthetic memory of the shameful scene is stored, so that all the terrible emotions can be recalled in the present through the slightest triggering event. If a little boy is molested by his mother, in adult life if a woman he loves touches him in the same way his mother did, he will experience the shame and fear of the original incident. He may avoid women and become a homosexual.

Third, there can be interpersonal need-shame binds, for example when a child is first abandoned for two days by alcoholic parents and experiences terror of dying, and then the parents come home and smother the child with gifts and attention. This person as an adult may alternate between clinging in relationships because of a fear of abandonment, and then pushing away due to a feeling of being smothered. The childhood incidents have set up a need-shame bind.

Three components of the shame experience: Kaufman says three things happen when a child who is growing up experiences a shaming incident, which Tomkins calls a *scene*. First, the child internalizes an *affect-belief* about the self. For example, if a little girl's mother shouts "You're so stupid!" then the child not only internalizes the belief "I am stupid" but also the emotion expressed in her mother's angry and disgusted voice. She will be forever angry and disgusted at her stupidity until that is dealt with. If her pastor so much as looks at her the wrong way, she may become afraid that the pastor is angry, believing and emotionally feeling pain that the pastor thinks she is stupid.

Second, the child will internalize out of the scene an *image of interaction pattern*. Kaufman gives the example of a boy who is repeatedly blamed by

mom or dad whenever things go wrong.⁹⁶ That boy has a head full of blaming scenes. When he grows up, he will behave toward himself as his parents did: he will take the blame every time anything happens which recalls one of those childhood blaming scenes. Whenever anything whatever goes wrong, he will consider it "my fault" and will not feel relief until he takes the blame and says "It was my fault."

Finally, the child who is shamed will internalize *identification images*. This means, for example, that a little boy or girl will confuse the shaming parent's very person with his or her own. The child will feel toward himself or herself exactly like the shaming parent did in the incident. As the child grows older, the child's memory fills up with voices which become confused with the child's own inner voice, so that as an adult the voice of the person's conscience is the voice of the person's shaming parent.

Remember, the examples are only one of many types of incidents that can happen for each category. The variety of scenes is as infinite as human behavior can make it.

How Shame Feels

How does shame feel? It hurts! Remember that shame results from varying degrees of rejection, abandonment, or abuse.

Shame means self-contempt and much more: Kaufman explains that a person organizes his or her life much as a writer of a play writes a script.⁹⁷ A script consists of a narrative full of scenes. A person who is shame-bound in one way or another will live by two basic types of scripts: *defending scripts* and *identity scripts*. Defending scripts aim to avoid or escape from shame. For example, a person with a blame-transfer defending script will constantly blame

others. Other defending scripts include rage, contempt, perfectionism, power plays, blaming, internal withdrawal, humor, and denial.⁹⁸

However, because the person's identity is bound to internalized shame-related beliefs, the person also "writes" not only defending scripts but also identity scripts for himself or herself. These identity scripts inevitably reproduce shame, so that the person is then considered "shame-prone."

Some of the identity scripts which Kaufman has uncovered include: (1) self-blame scripts, in which one always blames oneself; (2) comparison making scripts, in which one always compares oneself unfavorably to others; and (3) self-contempt scripts, in which the person actually rejects, is angry at, despises, and is disgusted with himself or herself. The end result of this very negative process can be disowning of oneself, and even more extreme, splitting of oneself into multiple personalities.

Shame means mental confusion: Take, for example, being told by a neighboring child's mother that one is a filthy child and not fit to play with her child because one's fingernails are dirty and uncut. In that instant, shame exposes the inner self to view, says Kaufman, and interrupts or halts communication by turning a person's attention inward and by "binding movement and speech, paralyzing the self."⁹⁹ One feels confused and cannot think clearly.¹⁰⁰ One then simultaneously wishes to hide, feels overwhelmed, and longs for reunion with whoever shamed the person (reminding the reader, perhaps, of the basic human need for the Atonement as a result of original sin).

After one grows up, the confusion is heightened by repression — the psychological defense of pushing the shame, its anxiety, and its causes out of consciousness.¹⁰¹ Both Marshall Shelley¹⁰² and David Augsburger¹⁰³ point out that when persons repress one emotion, they must repress all emotions. Persons wind

up unable to understand their own feelings due to the repression factor. Kaufman adds that shame can become a downward spiral in which the self is engulfed and the person becomes paralyzed.¹⁰⁴

Shame means less ability to deal with conflict: Savage remarks that inactive have less ability to deal with conflict than normal, and continue to hurt for a sustained length of time, up to many years.¹⁰⁵ According to Larry L. McSwain and William C. Treadwell, Jr., "Estrangement grows if reconciliation doesn't occur."¹⁰⁶ All the interviewees in the case studies of chapter four confirm that the hurt can last up to ten years. (The good news is that proper pastoral care can heal even such a long-lasting wound; it did in one out of three of the cases, with marked progress toward healing in the other two.)

Shame and Guilt: There is a great deal written in the psychological literature to distinguish shame and guilt.¹⁰⁷ Shame and guilt are alike but not identical. The definition given on the opening page of the book by Harper and Hoopes, Uncovering Shame, will be adequate to make the distinction:

Shame is an emotion in response to a negative evaluation of one's self, whereas guilt is an evaluation of **behavior**. ... Shame-prone persons interpret every incident as validation of how worthless they are, how bad they are, how unlovable, how incapable of loving and giving to others. Shame-prone people also experience guilt; however, rather than being healthy, this guilt is excessive, chronic, intense, and rarely producing of a change in behavior.¹⁰⁸

A guilty person may also feel shame; but whereas a guilty person might say, "I feel ashamed for what I have done," a shame-prone person might say, "I feel ashamed because of who I am due to what I did, what was done to me, or due to my circumstances." Guilty persons tend to fear that others will be angry, while shamed persons tend to fear others will be contemptuous and disgusted.

The guilty grieve over their actions; the shamed grieve over their reputations, their bad identity. A guilty person may feel shame because of the poten-

tial loss of reputation when others find out the guilt. Shamed persons do not necessarily feel guilt, though as stated above they may do so as a means of denying the shame. The shamed feel like, and will say that they are, innocent victims; the guilty know themselves as guilty, as perpetrators.

Paradoxically, a shamed person may hide the shame from themselves by feeling guilt. Cavanaugh says, "Because shame is such an intense and painful feeling, it is often masked or camouflaged by other emotions. One major masking emotion is guilt."⁹⁹ The psychological reason for this is that guilt hurts less than shame; therefore the psyche chooses the lesser pain. To the person with this affliction, nearly everything is cause for an apology. "I'm sorry, pastor," are words often heard from the person with this problem. Or, "I feel responsible." Erikson said in 1959 that "shame is an emotion ... easily absorbed by guilt."¹⁰⁰

Shame means extreme self-awareness: Phil Mollon says, "Shame heightens the awareness of the self."¹⁰¹ Examples of this have already been given in the section on works of philosophy and literature, most notably in the works of Sartre and Conrad and Hawthorne. Kaufman says:

The self feels exposed both to itself and to anyone else present. That exposure can be of the self to the self alone, or it can be of the self to others. Central to an understanding of the alienating affect is that shame can be an entirely internal experience.¹⁰²

One outcome, loss of ability to empathize, grows out of the extreme focus on the inner self at the expense of the external world.

Shame means loss of ability to empathize: A shame-prone person simply becomes insensitive to the true nature of the feelings and motivations of others. Shame-prone persons jump to conclusions and make false assumptions based on the particular shame-bind which has them in its grip.

The loss of empathy comes whenever the shame-prone person tries to protect the self through externalizing the shamed feeling. Many of the defending scripts mentioned above are attempts to externalize shame; for example, rage, contempt, and blame. June Price Tangney, of George Mason University, says

This externalization response probably does lessen the pain of shame in the short run. Unfortunately, it is also likely to be fairly irrational and counterproductive to an empathic exchange. The shamed person may either withdraw from the irrationally blamed other, as observed by Lewis (1971) and Lindsay-Hartz (1984), or react with a kind of hostile humiliated fury (Lewis, 1971; Scheff, 1987). In either event, the opportunity for empathy is lost.¹¹³

Tangney comments that "...even when shame-prone individuals do notice and initially empathize with another, their initial empathic response may become 'short-circuited'".¹¹⁴

There is a paradox here. Shame can cause a loss of boundaries between the shamed and the shamer. This produces excessive identification, or fusion, with the person who caused the shame-bind. The shamed person desires very much to be accepted by the one who did the shaming. However, the shaming incident produces an emotional fusion so that the shamed person cannot tell where the shamed self leaves off and the self of the shamer begins. As a result, shame-bound persons tend to confuse their own inner feelings about events with the reality. They make unwarranted, negative assumptions about the motivations of others. They lack empathy because they lack the ability to distinguish between their own beliefs and feelings and the beliefs and feelings of others.¹¹⁵ They become paranoid "insult collectors" who see deliberate attempts to insult them wherever they go.¹¹⁶

Shame-prone persons can cause empathic embarrassment in others: The shame-prone person is wrapped up in self-generated suspicion, looking for implied insults in the least little occurrence, imputing false and terrible mo-

tives to others. Those members who are not shame prone can be expected to have problems with the shame-prone when a shame incident occurs in a church, because of what Rowland S. Miller calls empathic embarrassment.¹¹⁷ In other words, because one church member sees that a second member is embarrassed, the first will because of empathy, feeling what another feels, also experience the incident as personally embarrassing. Miller observed in his study that the more embarrassable a person was, the more empathic embarrassment they felt.¹¹⁸

Remembering that the shame-prone person is actually less empathic, one might think that the shame-prone person would be less likely to catch someone else's embarrassment. However, this is not the case. Although the shame-prone person is less empathic with those considered to be the perpetrators of the shaming incident, tending to impute wrong motives that are not there, the shame-prone person because of field-dependence is even more likely to identify with another victim of embarrassment, once again imputing more embarrassment than the other person may actually feel. Consequently, when one person in church gets embarrassed, all the shame-prone population of that church could react with their own personal embarrassment to an even greater degree than the person originally embarrassed. This contagious effect is what makes shame incidents so serious for the small church.

Shame affects men and women in different ways due to cultural patterns:

Kaufman says men in American culture have traditionally been shamed for distress (shedding tears) and fear, for showing the need to be touched or held, and for the need to be united deeply with another person. Women, on the other hand, are shamed for expressing anger, seeking power, attempting to be distinct, or for putting their own desires ahead of others.

Helen B. Lewis held that women are more shame-prone than men because they are more field-dependent, i.e., more oriented toward fusion.¹¹⁹ Herbert Anderson also suggests that women experience shame more than men.¹²⁰ Kaufman, however, flatly states that "it is the differential shaming that women receive in comparison to men that produces the apparent differences in their development," i.e., cultural conditioning rather than an innate biological difference. A study done by June Price Tangney in 1988 corroborates Kaufman.¹²¹

Cultural training results in different ways of handling shame. According to S. Petronio, men tend to use justifying strategies more than do women in handling embarrassment, while women tend to offer excuses more than justifications. Men are quicker to apologize, quicker to blame an incident on something else rather than someone else, and are more desirous than women of having others indicate nothing inappropriate happened. According to Edith Gomberg, men are more likely to act out from shame while women get depressed instead (referring to men and women alcoholics).¹²²

Women, according to Petronio, prefer to blame the incident on someone else present, want the incident acknowledged publicly as inappropriate, prefer to have someone else volunteer to take the blame, want more sympathy expressed to them, and more strongly want others to become embarrassed too. Petronio interprets the results of her study by noting that "women are taught dependency as a coping mechanism."¹²³

Psychiatrists Severino, McNutt, and Feder recognize that "the development of autonomy is a relatively more difficult and complex task for women than for men in our society."¹²⁴ This fact may be the underlying reason why women have a harder time dealing with shame issues. They feel less in control and are more likely to feel dependent on someone else to fix the situation.

Since it is more often so in our culture that women are less autonomous and more dependent than men on the average, one consequence of this is that they are more likely to experience fusion, or what Helen Block Lewis called field-dependence; in other words, they are likely to suffer more deeply from shaming incidents since they have less ways of dealing with the shame, being more fused with others and seeing the shame of loved ones as their own shame.

The writer of this dissertation has known several women who match the above description. They experience their husband's shame as their own; they are hurt more deeply and stay upset longer; they have more trouble forgiving those whom they blame for the shaming incident; and they are more likely to blame others and view themselves as innocent victims. Remember, differences should be seen as statistical, and therefore there will be a bell curve of variations.

All this is highly relevant in a ministry to church dropouts who are shame-prone. Pastors should expect the wives to be far more bitter and unwilling to let bygones be bygones than the husband. (There are exceptions to this!) Also, the evidence from the study by Petronio may suggest that wives are quicker than men to forgive the incident if someone is willing to take the blame and apologize. That someone may be the pastor. However, pastors should not be surprised if the upset and shamed wife has someone very specific whom she wants to admit that the incident was their fault. Furthermore, she may not be willing to say who it is. She may prefer to nurse the grievance, because of fear of further humiliation if she accuses someone who refuses to apologize or take responsibility.

It is this author's experience that women sometimes behave as though they do not mind if the whole church gets into the act. Men, on the other hand, want the incident forgotten. In this author's experience, men tend to act right away

and then to forget the details of the matter. Because it is harder for men to remember who was at fault, men tend to be more forgiving over a period of time, though it is assumed that they can be just as shame-prone as women.

Some situations are more likely to cause shame: A pastor should be aware that certain situations are more likely to be dangerous than others. According to John Bradshaw, shame incidents are more likely to occur during the following situations, taking certain liberties with Bradshaw's list for explanatory purposes:

(1) talking to parents; (2) in relation to authority figures; (3) starting new relationships (such as, for purposes here, meeting people for the first time in Sunday School or worship); (4) when being praised (shame-prone people think it must be clever mockery of them, since by definition they cannot be good); (5) when someone gets hurt emotionally by someone else; (6) after a big success (producing anxiety because shame-prone people define themselves as losers); (7) during exchanges of affection; (8) being given feedback or constructive criticism (a major source!); (9) being rejected (for example being snubbed, not being chosen, being asked to leave, being overlooked, being bypassed, being excluded, being forgotten, being told off, or receiving anger [my own examples]).¹²

Defenses Against Shame

It has been established that shame hurts, and that people want to avoid it. When an incident happens which causes an individual to feel great shame, there are many different ways the person might react, in defense against shame. The following is an alphabetical list of defenses based on several sources:

Defenses against shame:

aggression	counterphobia	fusion
altruistic surrender	countershameness (shame-	grandiosity (pride)
asceticism	lessness)	guilt
blocking	denial	hiding
clinging to objects	depression	hostility
clowning	desexualization	intellectualization
mocking and scoffing	displacement	isolation
compulsions	distortion	lack of empathy
contempt	falling ill	masochism

multiple personalities	psychosis)	self-deception
narcissism	rage	shyness
neurosis	repression	sublimation
obsessions	restriction of ego	undoing
perfectionism	functions	unforgiveness
projection	schizophrenia	whistling in the dark
psychosis (borderline	secretiveness	withdrawal

Four of these defensive behaviors are of major interest in this dissertation, namely: **rage, depression, denial, and withdrawal**. The remaining pages of this chapter will be devoted to analyzing how they might be expected to affect church attendance in persons who are shame-prone.

Rage: "This is a disgrace, and I am offended," said Chief of Police Gates of Los Angeles on 4/4/91 when the Board of Supervisors put him on forced leave with pay. Normally, anger — being offended — follows shame immediately. However, for the shame-prone, the reaction is even more intense. Many times a shame-prone person will go into a rage. Hultberg tells of a group of protesters confronting the police. He says they were

Merely chanting the words: "Shame on you, shame on you." According to my patient this immediately made the police lose control over themselves and start attacking. ... [according to the patient] it was a really serious provocation which logically had to bring about a violent response....¹²⁶

Rage is more than just anger; rage is anger out of control and ready to do harm in retaliation. Shame-prone rage, says Tangney, is an "irrational 'humiliated fury' directed toward the self and / or the other (Lewis, 1971; Scheff, 1987)."¹²⁷

It must be kept in mind that if the shame-prone person is not using guilt as a way to deal with the shame, then there will probably be no normal barrier of guilt or conscience keeping the shame-prone person from doing retaliatory harm. Shame-based persons can be guiltless and downright sociopathic, i.e.,

without a conscience. In fact, sociopaths are, as this writer understands it, severely shame-based individuals. Phil Mollon says,

The heightened awareness of the self in states of shame, whereby that which is normally quietly in the background is suddenly in the foreground, may cause a marked disruption of functioning often involving feelings of confusion and a flooding of autonomic stimulation. This tends to release rage. Levin (1971), for example, writes of 'defusion of the instincts' in shame, so that unbound aggression is let loose. Kohut (1977) similarly writes of 'narcissistic rage' as a disintegration product of the break-up of the self."¹²⁸

Sorotzkin says that narcissistic personalities "are not yet able to be affected by guilt feelings, although they often attempt to portray their shame reactions in terms of high moral ideals (Kohut, 1971)."¹²⁹ Kurt Reizler has said,

...wise men ... have advised ... never to put a man to shame lest they create a kind of hate keener than the hate from any other source and slower to heal. ... There is no doubt about the strength and tenacity of the resentment created."¹³⁰

Andrew Morrison explains that "some of the difficulties that confront the analyst in attempting to deal with shame" are that "The patient tries to conceal her humiliation, and leads with her rage. ... The reminder that she is not uniquely special" to the therapist "feels like an absolute abandonment."¹³¹

Pastoral experience confirms that a great deal of the rage is generated when situations develop which tear down the shame-prone person's delusion that he or she is uniquely special. No one else can teach this Sunday School class; no one else can lead the singing or the worship; no one else but the shame-prone person, who tends to gravitate to leadership positions to make up for feelings of inferiority. Nothing short of restoration of that place of special importance will do, it seems, to calm the rage.

There is a connection between the rage reaction and the presence of pride, unstable high esteem, or grandiosity. Severino, McNutt, and Feder say that instead of consciously feeling self-hatred, "in some patients shame may be

transformed into rage (Kohut, 1972) or into paranoid or grandiose delusions."¹³²

Kernis et. al. did a study that showed anger to be the likely reaction of persons with unstable high esteem:

...the greater tendency of unstable high self-esteem individuals to experience anger can be attributed to their possession of a positive but fragile self-view. These individuals may appear quite confident and secure, but in reality they are insecure and highly sensitive to evaluative feedback (Turner, 1968). In a sense, those with unstable high self-esteem have the most to lose from a self-esteem threat, as their positive self-views are particularly vulnerable to challenge. One way to protect against such challenge is to become angry and deny the legitimacy of the perceived injustice. Anger, then, may serve primarily a self-protective function for these individuals.¹³³

Patton adds that enraged persons who are also shamed have more difficulty forgiving.¹³⁴ It must be remembered that the rage and unforgiveness stem from a deeply wounded inner self. Says Gershen Kaufman:

Shame is likely whenever our most basic expectations of a significant other are exposed as wrong. To have someone we value unexpectedly betray our trust opens the self inside us and exposes it to view. 'What a fool I was to trust him!'¹³⁵ The anger evidenced is but a mask covering the ruptured self.

Depression: John Savage says that people tend to react to conflict in one of two basic ways: they either become "skunks" or "turtles." A skunk is one who gets angry at others. The skunk feels frustrated and helpless and reacts first with anger, then with apathy and bitterness.¹³⁶ (It has just been shown that the shame-prone individual may take this much further than mere anger.)

Turtles, on the other hand, are those who in reaction to conflict get angry, not at others, but at themselves. Turtles convert their shame and humiliation feelings into guilt. They feel, not helpless, but hopeless. They draw into their shell. An intense feeling of hopelessness in a turtle can lead to clinical boredom and even suicidal tendencies. Turtles can be more difficult to reach than skunks.¹³⁷ Corroboration of the difficulty is found in two stud-

ies, one by Nergaard and Silberschatz, the other by Marziali et. al., both of which conclude that persons with high ratings of shame, who are passive and withdrawn, show great resistance and have poor outcomes in psychotherapy.¹³²

Denial: When the pastor comes to visit a person who no longer attends church because of an incident deriving from shame-proneness, the pastor may find that the person denies feeling any shame. The person may also be fuzzy on facts, though sounding as though their memory is functioning perfectly. This does not become apparent until the pastor checks with other people who witnessed the incident. It becomes evident that the person is denying anything shameful happened at all.

Denial occurs because of repression. The person pushes from consciousness the shame, the anxiety from the shame, and past incidents during which the person felt shame. This can lead to behavior which is called Pollyanna behavior. It is also called "narapoia," which is paranoia spelled backwards because it is the apparent opposite of paranoia, resulting from repression.¹³⁹ Kaufman says,

Denial can be the most entrenched of all the scripts. It is a generalized strategy of defense that always distorts perception as well as the quality of interpersonal interactions. Its effect is to neutralize the impact of others. Denial scripts literally deny access to the self....¹⁴⁰

Denial, says Kaufman, is what a person does when there is no possible action to take. "Denial scripts attempt to exclude shame from awareness by denying its perception, or by denying the perception of anything that might arouse shame."¹⁴¹

If indeed denial is a major part of the shame experience, then much of the work of Elizabeth Kubler-Ross and others who have worked on grief can be applied to the healing of shame. Kubler-Ross goes on to say how denial is a source of health: "Denial functions as a buffer after unexpected shocking news, allows the

patient to collect himself and, with time, to mobilize other, less radical defenses."¹⁴² One might very well go ahead and say that a person who sustains a major embarrassment or humiliation goes through all five stages of grief according to Kubler-Ross: denial, anger, depression, bargaining, and finally acceptance. This would certainly explain the repression and also the intense anger that pastors routinely see in persons who are shame-prone. It also explains why pastors might not enjoy dealing with shame-prone people.

Withdrawal: Withdrawal can be both internal and external. Speaking of internal withdrawal, Sidney Levin says that individuals who are relatively secure often tend to think of shame-prone people as withdrawn:

There are many highly sensitive people who react to criticism or rejection with intense shame from early life onwards. They are often quite secretive and may be incorrectly perceived by others to be snobbish.¹⁴³

According to J. R. Nichols, the question in the back of the mind of the shamed person is, "How can you possibly like/accept/respect me when (or if) I tell you all these terrible things about myself?"¹⁴⁴

Internal withdrawal easily leads into external withdrawal, i.e., staying away from the people in front of whom one was ashamed. Eric Erikson says that shame makes us want to hide.¹⁴⁵ Lewis linked shame with interpersonal withdrawal in 1971, and so did Lindsay-Hartz in 1984.¹⁴⁶ Withdrawal is a standard feature observed in persons who feel deep shame or humiliation. For a church member, this might mean ceasing to attend church. John Savage calls this sort of person a turtle. They feel, not helpless, but hopeless. They draw into their shell. An intense feeling of hopelessness in a turtle can lead to clinical boredom and even suicidal tendencies. Turtles can be more difficult to reach than skunks.¹⁴⁷

Kaufman explains that there is an intimate connection between internal withdrawal and externally staying away from people:

Individuals who are innately predisposed toward introversion defend against shame by internal withdrawal. Relationships are either avoided or abandoned, and the individuals may display an oscillating in-and-out pattern with respect to relationships. Ambivalence characterizes their interpersonal relations, resulting in a *schizoid* posture. Introverts behave in this way in response to excessive shame because their innate temperament already is focused predominantly inward. Shame, though deeply disruptive, manifests in withdrawal deeper inside the self. A social mask convincingly disguises the inner turmoil.¹⁴⁸

A pastor must be on guard also because withdrawal can be a symptom that a person is a neurotic who needs professional help. Robert James Sinclair, in his book Neurotics in the Church, lists three basic ways neurotics respond to shame: self-effacement, attack, and withdrawal.¹⁴⁹ Neurotics tend to idolize themselves as respectable, and loss of respectability is to be guarded against at all costs. If attack fails, one may see a neurotic go into deep withdrawal or else severe self-effacement.¹⁵⁰ One recognizes a neurotic by the tendency to overreact to shame.

With or without some shaming incident that becomes the straw that breaks the camel's back, the withdrawn person drops out of church. When the pastor comes to visit, the withdrawn person sincerely acts as though he or she has just been out of church for any number of petty reasons; nothing is wrong; no, it wasn't that little embarrassing incident or confrontation you heard about. They deny everything.

If they do not deny everything, they lay blame and are not willing to forgive. They don't want to forgive because that would mean going back to church and facing the person, which they do not want to do for intense internal reasons.

Withdrawal and Nonattendance

Anxiety from multiple conflicts: John S. Savage says that the likelihood of a person leaving a church is increased significantly when there is what he terms "multiple conflict."¹⁵¹ Four types of anxiety-provoking events, from most common to least, usually trigger avoidance of church, i.e., "inactivity" — especially when they come in clusters: a) family fights, b) conflict with the pastor, c) conflict with other families in the church, and d) overwork.¹⁵² In the study of the three couples in chapter five, in every case there was multiple conflict at work. Savage mentions four types of stress, or anxiety, at work commonly in persons who become inactive in church.¹⁵³

Reality anxiety: First, there is reality anxiety. In Peaceful UMC, some examples of reality anxiety, based on actual persons,¹⁵⁴ are: falling and breaking one's back; losing a means of livelihood; going bankrupt; the death of a parent; the death of a spouse; surgery in the hospital; and miscarriage.

Moral Anxiety: Again, at Peaceful UMC, some examples of moral anxiety are: guilt over inability to pay creditors; guilt from shortchanging the Internal Revenue Service; guilt from not fulfilling the obligations of a church officer; guilt from an alcoholic life-style; and guilt from not attending church because of laziness.

Neurotic Anxiety: In the case studies of chapter five, two of the wives had unrealistic fears of being rejected, which resulted in actual damage to relationships because of lack of effort to cultivate them. In another case at Peaceful UMC, someone actually believed that the pastor did not want to baptize their son, in spite of direct verbal evidence and witnesses to the contrary.

Existential Anxiety: When a person does not know the outcome of a tense situation, such as in the intensive care unit of the hospital, the stress gene-

rated is existential — having to do with primordial questions of existence, such as "Will my husband live or die?"; "Will I live or die?"; or "Will my sins keep me out of heaven?" Persons under such severe stress tend to be on edge and will quickly take offense if the pastor is not sensitive.

Any shame-based anxieties will be particularly evident when there are existential concerns. For example, a pastor visited a man who had cancer about two months before the man died. The pastor stupidly talked about the belief of some that sickness was caused by sin, without in any way implying that such was the case with the man. However, the man and his wife were incensed. They did not show it at the time, but the pastor realized later that he had made a major faux pas when the wife called him, very angry. The very idea of accusing her husband of being a sinner! Her anger was not over guilt, but shame that her husband was thought by a pastor to be such a sinner that God was taking his life.

Precipitating events for nonattendance: It seems that there is always an identifiable "straw that broke the camel's back" which precipitates withdrawal from church by the offended person. In one case at Peaceful UMC, it was a letter from the pastor stuffed hurriedly in the mailbox instead of a personal phone call from the pastor. In several other cases, it was the lack of protective interference by other church members when the offended person received public and intolerable criticism, damaging a reputation.

In the next chapter, the setting will be presented for a case study of a church with shame-related problems among many of its members, followed by a statistical study and further interviews.

CHAPTER FOUR

The Setting: Peaceful United Methodist Church¹⁵⁵

Introduction

Peaceful United Methodist Church, a small church in a rural area, has many things of which it can be proud. However, it also has a number of things in its history which are crippling it with shame, embarrassment, and humiliation. This chapter focuses on the background and context of Peaceful in order to illuminate the studies of the members found in the chapters following this one.

Sociological Background

Economic Environment

The membership of Peaceful is made up today of farmers, truck drivers, a few retired businessmen, schoolteachers, factory workers, store owners, an agricultural specialist, a computer programmer, a butane salesman, a parts salesman, and several widows. About half the total resident membership is retired.

Personal income averages between living on Social Security to about \$50,000 per year. The average salary (just a guess) is about equal to the pastor's salary. A couple of the farmers in the church, and some of the retired people, would be near millionaires if they sold their land, but this will never happen; they appear to live from hand to mouth although in fact they are wealthy by city standards.

Few tithe in the active membership. With attendance falling from about fifty five years ago to about thirty at the time of this writing, nevertheless the Sunday morning offerings remain constant. The yearly budget each year has been a little above \$20,000, half of which goes for Peaceful's half of the pas-

tor's salary. The church has paid its conference apportionments only once in the past five years; in each of the other years emergency repairs caused Peaceful to pay only about half its conference askings.

Demographics

Peaceful is located about ten miles from the nearest small town in an area where farming is on the wane. Population is simultaneously shifting to the cities and building up as a sort of rural semi-suburbanization of neighboring towns, since city land is so expensive. Most people work in town and have all their ties in town, but live in the country.

The people who come to Peaceful, however, are mostly truly rural people whose ancestors founded the church nearly 150 years ago. Several families are descendants of the founding fathers of the church, and can prove it by a tour of the large old well-kept cemetery behind Peaceful. Tracing genealogies is an important and popular hobby in these parts.

Over the past ten years, every United Methodist church in the county, except a handful of the city churches, has experienced a loss of membership as the population shifts out of the county and as older rural people die off. Although Peaceful has about 120 on its rolls, only 86 of them are actually residents. The rest have moved years ago, and forwarding addresses have been lost.

Historical Background

Origin

Peaceful United Methodist Church is one of the oldest churches in its particular county in the state. Named after a sister church in South Carolina, from whence most of the founding members came, Peaceful was founded in 1847. This was a long time ago: James K. Polk, the eleventh president of the United

States, had just ended the war against Mexico. The Civil War was nearly twenty years in the future; slavery was common when the church was founded, and many founding members had slaves who stood outside church and watched the horses during services in the early years.

In 1915, the original building, with its old square nails and heavy wooden beams, was torn down. A second church building was constructed, but a tornado came only five years later, in 1920, and "raptured" most of the new building. A third building was finished in 1922, and is the one used today, with the addition of a fellowship hall and educational annex in 1974. The present building is the picture-perfect epitome of a small rural church. A photograph of it would make a good cover for a church bulletin. However, all is not as it looks.

One incident of humiliation in the church that occurred seventy-five years ago is known to the author. The importance of the incident may be judged by the reader, but it should be evident that it was important since the story has been passed down to the current generation.

It seems that, around 1915, a certain Sunday School teacher, in an effort to help raise money for the building fund, started a project to make a large quilt. Every person who gave ten cents would have his or her name stitched into the quilt. The teacher then planned to auction off the quilt at the next large gathering of church members, and give all the money to the church for the new building. She travelled near and far collecting dimes, and met many times with the ladies of the church to embroider the quilt and stitch in the names.

The plan went exceedingly well up to the last. People from as far away as California heard about the quilt and paid their dimes to have their names appear on the quilt. This writer has seen the quilt and it is magnificent, having a very large number of names. It is a historical record if nothing else.

However, when time came to auction off the quilt, it was a time of year when no one had very much money. (Building materials they had, and willingness to work, but not cash.) To start the bidding, the Sunday School teacher bid twenty-five cents. However, everyone there had secretly agreed not to bid in order that this beloved teacher might end up with the quilt. They meant it as an honor, but the teacher felt she had been humiliated instead, since everyone refused to bid for the quilt. For her, it was as if they were shunning all her efforts.

A proud person, she took the quilt home and put it in a box and never took it out again. On her deathbed, she gave it to one of her granddaughters who had expressed a great love for the quilt. To this day, that family remembers the quilt incident, as do elderly members of the church. Such things form a church's personality.

An Unhappy Yoking

From 1961 to 1966, Peaceful UMC was barely strong enough to stand on its own as a "station charge." About 120 members attended each Sunday. However, this did not last, and Peaceful was connected with another three churches on the Booker Charge¹⁵⁶ fifteen miles away, sharing one pastor. Peaceful had the sole burden of payments on a parsonage located alongside the church, now, plus the added burden of payments on the Booker Charge parsonage.

When the Booker Charge was disbanded a few years later, there was trouble over the Booker parsonage. Peaceful received no equity when the charge was disbanded. As a result, Peaceful church members got their feelings hurt; it was as if the powers that be did not care for them, not helping them to be treated fairly. However, Peaceful members said they could make it since they were such a strong church.

Peaceful was taken from the Booker Charge and yoked with Grader's Chapel,¹⁵⁷ a small rural church also formerly of the Booker Charge and only seven miles away from Peaceful. This made a new two-point charge called the Lickskillet Charge.¹⁵⁸ Here again comes another shaming incident in the history of Peaceful.

Roughly half the size of Peaceful, but very strong in attendance and wealth, Grader's Chapel had no desire to link up with Peaceful, a church which Grader's Chapel members felt was proud (Peaceful had tried to be a station charge) and in debt. Also, Grader's Chapel members did not want to be dominated by a larger church, having to give in to the larger numbers of the larger church whenever there was a decision to be made affecting the charge.

Grader's Chapel members were upset when the District Superintendent met with them to push the new Lickskillet Charge plan. One member was so upset that he had a heart attack in the middle of the meeting and broke the meeting up. He was taken to the hospital, but was dead on arrival. Feelings were running high!

The upshot of it all was that Grader's Chapel got the upper hand over larger Peaceful, just like a younger brother who has saved his allowance gets the upper hand over an older spendthrift brother who needs a loan. Grader's Chapel demanded and got the right to have all four of its Sunday morning services each month, including fifth Sundays, at 11:00 a.m., while Peaceful had to agree to take the 9:30 a.m. services. Twenty years later, there are still a few members of Peaceful living in the community who stopped attending — and still don't attend — in protest of this unfairness to Peaceful. To the present day, Peaceful has all its services except Homecoming at 9:30 a.m. (Grader's Chapel said Peaceful could have their Homecoming service at 11:00 a.m.)

The agreement was that Grader's Chapel would not have to help with the payments on the parsonage at Peaceful, even though, unlike Peaceful, Grader's Chapel had received equity money from the Booker Charge parsonage when the Booker Charge split up. The one thing Grader's Chapel would do, however, was to pay half the pastor's salary. This was an absolute necessity if the charge was to be formed, since Peaceful did not have enough income from its dropping attendance to pay more than half the pastor's salary.

The deal for the Licksillet Charge went through. However, the psyche of Peaceful took a terrible beating. Furthermore, as shall be seen, there were other factors which entered to cause a lowering of morale even further.

Contributions of Various Parties

The Old Guard

The "old guard" runs Peaceful UMC. Each year when it is time to elect new officers, the old faithful workers are recycled. An attempt is made to fit in any younger persons who have come along and shown an ability to work; however, inevitably, these new persons do not seem to realize the importance of the monthly board meetings where decisions are made.

The lay leader is a man who fought in the Battle of the Bulge in World War II and who just retired last year. He helps the pastor by conducting the morning worship service up to the time the pastor preaches. He goes to annual conference. The lay leader is also the chairman of the board and head of the pastor-parish relations committee, since certain other people in the past did not work out in these posts. The lay leader is quite a hard worker in the church. His wife goes wherever he goes, and is the second hardest worker in the church.

Every so often the lay leader jokingly puts the pastor in his place by "warning" the pastor that he can always be moved to another small rural community on the opposite side of the state. Everyone always laughs.

New Blood

The pastor, this writer, has brought in several families in the past five years. In each case, before long, the new members, or "new blood," are put to work by making them officers of the church in some capacity or other. However, even though they do whatever work is assigned them, these newcomers do not attend board meetings. They cut the grass or help with potluck meals, help decorate for Halloween or Easter or teach in Vacation Bible School. Yet they do not attend board meetings, because the old guard runs the church.

After awhile, the "new blood" begins to take a back seat. The "new blood" tends to adopt the sporadic attendance pattern of the old guard. No amount of effort has yet succeeded in getting a new Sunday School class of "new blood" going. Their loyalty is primarily to the current pastor, who visits them and preaches the kind of sermons they like.

Trouble With Previous Pastors

Short Appointments with Unproven Pastors

The writer is the longest serving pastor in memory at Peaceful. The writer had been serving in South America on the mission field, and came off the mission field in the middle of the year, when few appointments were available. The writer took the Lickskillet Charge as a temporary assignment, beginning in February of 1986, and was expected to move in June of 1986, but asked to continue.

Ever since the Lickskillet Charge was established, the charge has received mostly seminary students or seminary graduates, who quickly moved on. Since 1972, the appointments have been as follows:

June 1972 -- June 1977: student pastor (left Peaceful upon graduation)
 June 1977 -- June 1979: student pastor (left Peaceful upon graduation)
 June 1979 -- June 1981: lay pastor (left to go to seminary)
 June 1981 -- Oct. 1981: student pastor (left the ministry)
 Oct. 1981 -- June 1982: student pastor (left Peaceful before graduating)
 June 1982 -- June 1983: student pastor (left Peaceful upon graduation)
 June 1983 -- June 1984: student pastor (left Peaceful upon graduation)
 June 1984 -- Feb. 1986: student pastor (left the ministry)
 Feb. 1986 -- present: this writer

Signs of Shame-Based Attitudes

Suspicion of Rejection

1. Belief that the pastor will not want to stay: When there are enough damaging incidents, a lack of self-confidence and low self-esteem can infest a whole church. Many persons will express intense wonder, year after year, that a pastor could possibly want to stay with them. This was the case at Peaceful and Grader's Chapel for fully four years after this writer arrived.

2. Lack of mutual support in group life: What Lyle Schaller calls group life¹⁵⁹ was almost totally lacking at Peaceful UMC in 1986. A sign of this was the low to nil attendance at funerals when even a pillar of the church had a death in the family. (Happily, there is now much more group life presently at Peaceful.)

This was in great contrast to Grader's Chapel. When the writer held a revival a year or so ago at a church 30 miles away, four carloads of church members from Grader's Chapel came and attended, while no one from Peaceful came. This was an indicator, not of dislike of the pastor, but of a hurt group life

at Peaceful UMC. Shame had caused the loss of a sense of reward in gathering together for any common cause. There was no *esprit de corps*.

3. Sporadic attendance: The evidence of church attendance, at Peaceful UMC especially, is that all except the most faithful exhibit highly sporadic or irregular attendance. This is still the case at present.

Of the entire congregation of 83 resident members at Peaceful, in 1990, only one person scored higher than 90% attendance; only eight (9.6%) scored between 80% and 90%. There were no perfect attenders. On the other hand, at Grader's Chapel, where there is a better sense of self-esteem and no history of internal bickering and scandal, of the entire congregation of 49 resident members there were three who scored 90% or higher on attendance, and five (10.2%) who scored between 80% and 90%.

The smaller church, with 49 resident members, would have more in attendance in church on Sunday morning than its bigger sister church who has 83 resident members. The average of percent-of-perfect-attendance scores at Peaceful for 1990 was 41.3%; at Grader's Chapel, it was 59.6%. Even more revealing, the standard deviation of attendance scores for Peaceful was 34.4; whereas at Grader's Chapel it was 23.3. This shows clearly that the larger church had a larger spread in its attendance scores. The smaller church had a tighter grouping; one might say there is more herd instinct at the smaller church, whereas at the larger church, there are only a few in any attendance category.

It could be concluded that even Peaceful's most faithful members are not all that faithful. Peaceful in 1990 had much fewer really faithful church members so far as attendance is concerned. The reason for this is shame, most likely, resulting in a general pattern of withdrawal.

Conversations over the past five years back up this idea. People have said in so many words that it wears them out emotionally to come to church too often. They go as often as they can, they say. Then they need a break. It must be remembered that each time a person comes to church they come to a place of memories. For the people at Peaceful, there is a heavy weight of memories that are far from pleasant. It takes emotional energy to face those unpleasant memories, most of which could be classed as shaming events. The wonder is that they come to church as often as they do.

4. Secrecy: Keeping secrets is another sign of shame. Just as it is a feature in the homes of alcoholics,¹⁶⁰ it is a feature in a shame-bound church. This writer was quite amazed the first year to learn how many persons who were active in the life of the church seemed to have absolutely no idea of the reason why various individuals -- all wounded or humiliated in church fights -- had stopped coming to church. They seemed to know that there had been some kind of incident, but said that they "didn't know" what it was all about.

The pastor may assume that because persons are sharing with the pastor, they have shared with each other. The surprising fact is that this is often not the case. The pastor may be amazed over time to find out how little is known to the general congregational member about the most crucial incidents.

No doubt, the persons involved in the several incidents at Peaceful did in fact keep the details secret. However, without their realizing it, the result of keeping the lid on the various incidents was the further isolation and rejection of those who were offended. To the offended, it seemed as though the church members did not care. To the church members, it seemed as though the offended one "for some reason just stopped coming," or that they did not care.

Natural aversion to shaming incidents kept people from "prying" or "being

a busybody," with the result that the victims felt more and more unwanted as time went by. No one came to apologize or find out about them. Thus their shame was increased further, and a blanket of ignorance and silence fell over incident after incident, creating a cesspool of negative and low self-esteem within the personality of the church so that eventually no one dared ask anyone else why they missed church last week.

A History of Betrayal During Conflict

Betrayal by Pastors: Some former pastors were guilty of the abominable practice of playing off one church against another, telling each church a different story in order to excuse their own mistakes. This happened with two of the more recent pastors. One incident involved a pastor not handing over the bank notices that came to his mailbox addressed to the church. As a result, the church nearly defaulted on a loan before it was found out.

In another series of incidents, one pastor encouraged both churches to establish a fund for helping the poor called the Helping Hand Fund. He got total charge of this fund. He spent all that money somewhere but gave no accounting. Then he charged so many items to the churches (without asking permission) that it took a full year after he left before all the bills were discovered and paid off. As a result of incidents like these, the leadership of both churches were very uncertain if any pastor could be trusted.

Betrayal During Conflict: Peaceful also has had a series of embarrassing and maddening incidents involving power-hungry individuals. Although no details can be given without incriminating the individuals involved, who still belong to the church, suffice it to say that the membership at large has had much embarrassment as a result of this or that lay person in the church abusing authority in one way or another. Again, many of these incidents are not common

congregational knowledge; however, they are common knowledge among the fairly large group of people who from year to year serve as church officers and who rotate from one job to another, as happens in most small churches. There is a sense of fear of being embarrassed among the leadership at Peaceful.

Hypocrisy by the Rank and File: Several of those who were alienated from church by church conflicts expressed one theme very strongly: they felt betrayed by the whole church, because when they spoke up in meetings against current leadership, as individuals had asked them to before the meeting, no one backed them up. Those alienated bitterly accused those who would not back them up as being hypocrites.

The next chapter will study three couples who dropped out and ceased attending church entirely.

CHAPTER FIVE

A Case Study: Three Inactive Couples

Introducing the Ones, Twos and Threes

Methodology

Because of shaming events, three families stopped attending Peaceful UMC. Call them Mr. and Mrs. One, Mr. and Mrs. Two, and Mr. and Mrs. Three. The events go back from two to ten years ago. The couples have had a good, even a close, relationship over a five year period with this writer as their pastor.

The identities and situations of each couple are disguised. The basic facts of each case cover a rough spectrum from deeply shaming incidents to lightly shaming incidents at church. As it so happens, the family most shamed by the church has the least humiliating outside circumstances, while the family least shamed by the church has the most humiliating outside circumstances.

The thrust will be to see if there is a pattern formed by their answers which supports the hypothesis that shame is a significant ingredient in their decisions to cease attending church.

Questions Asked By the Interviewer

There were several interviews of each family, until each of the questions (which were the same for each family) were answered. Notes were taken and typed up later the same day as verbatims. (This writer has had professional instruction and practice in writing verbatims.) Although the verbatims will not be shown, nor will the details of each case be given due to considerations of privacy, here are the questions which were asked:

Part I: What Happened

1. Leading up to the main incident(s), what were the events that occurred? Please try to indicate the sequence of events building up to the main wounding incident(s).

2. What was the main wounding event? When did this happen? For this question please concentrate on facts; we'll get to feelings later.

3. How did your spouse react and feel?

4. How did you feel?

5. As well as you can tell, how did various church members feel toward you, i.e., what was their attitude and action after the incident?

6. What happened after the incident, i.e., how did it change things? How were relationships different afterwards?

7. What things did you do or not do; what actions did you take? (For example: confrontation; go to another church; tell your mother or other family member, etc.)

8. What did other church members do or not do after the incident? How did their behavior make you feel?

9. How has your church attendance been affected?

Part II: Your Analysis

1. What was the real kernel of the hurt? What hurt the most; i.e., what would be the name of the sin committed against you? Please say it as many different ways as occur to you. Why was this particularly painful to you? (Have other past hurts made you sensitive?...)

2. Why do you think the person(s) wounding you did what they did and said what they did?

3. Why is it particularly so hard to forgive, what they did and said?

4. With the benefit of hindsight and time, what could you have said or done differently? Why? What were you tempted to do or say?

5. What could the pastor have done to prevent the incident from being so bad?

6. What could other church members have done to prevent the incident from being so bad?

7. What could the pastor have done to heal things after the incident?

8. What could church members have done to heal things after the incident?

9. What could still be done to heal things;

a. What should the pastor be doing,

b. What should the church members be doing,

c. What should you be doing?

10. What aspects of your hurt are too late to fix? (For example, attending another church now; changed mind about this church; unforgivable words that were spoken, etc.)

11. What would have to happen in order for you to feel welcome at this church again? (Please work hard to name some things, even

if they would not work on you. Pretend you were the offender; what would feel you ought to do towards the one you hurt? Even if it didn't change their mind.)

12. What healing things, if any, have occurred?

13. How have you changed and what have you learned as a result of this painful incident in your life?

A Brief Description of Each Family Situation

Family One

Family One was directly involved in the most intense shaming incident at the church, in a chargewide meeting. This family will be referred to as Mr. and Mrs. One. In the shaming incident, which occurred about 8 years ago, the current pastor, an untrained lay preacher serving for the first time, supposedly cursed Mr. One and threatened to throw a punch at Mr. One, according to one witness. Other witnesses corroborate the feeling of Mr. One that he was being targeted as the enemy by the pastor, and that the other board members did not speak up in his defense. On the other side, friends of the pastor say that he was a very good pastor and that he still comes from Kentucky to visit them.

Mr. One had been selected, as chairman of the board, to speak for a committee who had gone (unknown to the pastor) to see the district superintendent because of unhappiness with the pastor. Mr. One felt secure, knowing that he had been asked by the board to speak on their behalf. What Mr. One was not prepared for was the board's total silence. They made it appear to the pastor as if Mr. One had done everything on his own.

In that meeting, the presence of members of Grader's Chapel, who liked the pastor, apparently caused members of Peaceful to decide individually that they would just keep quiet and let Mr. One speak for them ... without letting the pastor know their part in sending Mr. One to the district superintendent. When the pastor reacted with outrage to the threat of Mr. One's trip to the district

superintendent, uttering bad language and apparently raising his arms, Mr. One waited for someone to say they had sent him. When no one spoke, Mr. One said that if this was the way Methodists treated one another, he no longer wanted to be a Methodist; then he left, and has never returned except for rare events such as funerals of friends. His daughter had her wedding in another church, which still hurts her to this day. His wife was most bitter about the incident. Mr. and Mrs. One joined another church.

Mr. and Mrs. One seemed glad, even relieved, to talk, but had absolutely made a mental divorce from Peaceful. In this case, the shaming was from the cursing, from the threat of physical attack, from being singled out for rejection by the pastor, and from the shamed reaction of others present. They said that the pastor had circulated a letter before the meeting which attacked Mr. One. Also, they said the pastor said things against Mr. One in public prior to the meeting. Absolutely worst of all, according to Mr. and Mrs. One, the others in the meeting did not defend Mr. One. They behaved as if ashamed of Mr. One, and as if Mr. One were in the wrong.

As has been established in chapter two, shame begets shame; in this case, several of the church members had privately sided with Mr. One before the meeting, but in the meeting had behaved as if ashamed of Mr. One by remaining silent. According to Mr. One, this hurt most of all.

Family Two

Family Two is in the middle of the spectrum of shaming incidents. Their shaming involved not only one incident with the church which was not so serious, but also shaming circumstances not related to the church — personal distress caused by other family members, and some financial distress. Mrs. Two was quite

preoccupied with a family member who was a shame-prone person herself and who was trying to dominate and humiliate her.

Mrs. Two, for reasons not disclosed here, had fairly low self-esteem and admitted to being easily offended, easily upset, and easily threatened at the time of the interviews. Mr. Two on the other hand is a pillar of strength in the entire extended family and is not easily shamed or offended. When Mr. Two, a church officer, was slighted through a careless act by the pastor and administrative board, Mrs. Two took deep offense and kept the Twos away from church, even though Mr. Two would have returned, feeling the incident was a minor one.

The Twos did not return to church even after many pleas and visits from their friends in church; but they came back to church shortly after the interviews! According to Mr. and Mrs. Two, simply being listened to by their pastor and being allowed to express themselves freely had a beneficial effect.

It is most likely that the combination of pastoral and church member visits was the trigger of their returning. This writer also enjoyed some additional very happy visits with Mrs. Two in which some encouragement about self-esteem issues apparently took effect. This is the opinion of Mr. Two.

Both the Twos have remained active and involved since they have returned, Although not close yet to the level of involvement they had in the past, they will likely be completely reintegrated. Others have since taken over the old offices held by the Twos, but the main reason the Twos are shying away from office is the chance of another rejection, says Mr. Two.

What is noteworthy in this case is that when Mrs. Two became stronger regarding the family member who had been tearing her down, she was able to release her feelings of having been humiliated by the church. She had perhaps transferred her feelings of rejection from the family member over to the church,

so that she felt rejected by the church when in reality she was not being rejected; but when she bravely confronted the obnoxious family member and got relief and self-esteem back, the issue with the church shrank in size in her mind. She was able to face going back to church, although she did it in stages, and is still sensitive to any situation into which rejection in any form might be implied.

Mrs. Two first attended some events at Peaceful and tested the waters in that way before she was finally ready to return. She had encouragement and genuine respect from both her husband and her pastor, which put her over the hump. She now helps with certain chores at church, and is once again speaking to everyone. She usually feels included, which in fact she is. She relieves feelings of fear of being rejected or embarrassed by talking with her pastor, this writer, who encourages her to handle those feelings.

Family Three

Family Three was probably hurt by the church only slightly more than the Twos, but had many more personal problems which were of an embarrassing and rightly enraging nature to them. Although years ago a pastor (a different one from in the case of the Ones) verbally attacked Mr. Three in private on one occasion, Mr. Three, who is an aggressive person, simply threatened the pastor right back and was not very deeply hurt by it, according to Mr. Three, although Mr. Three still recounts the incident as though it were yesterday. Mr. Three was chairman of the administrative board at the time.

Mr. Three was involved in other incidents of a combative nature in which he felt abandoned and not supported by fellow board members or church members. For each episode, Mrs. Three took much more offense, but both kept coming to church nevertheless. From comments they made, the Threes kept coming so as not

to appear "chased off," "less committed than so-and-so to the church," or "embarrassed."

Mr. Three had resigned from the chairmanship, and both the Threes had begun to take a back seat in church decision-making when this writer arrived on the scene, about a year after the incidents. Their attendance was still fair and had not changed substantially. However, Mr. Three then had severe financial problems due to the local economy and due to personal illness and inability to work. He had to declare bankruptcy. Then his father died, and his selfish stepmother talked him into giving her the house which his father had given him to live in. He was terribly hurt and rejected by his stepmother. He had to move to a neighboring town, the town of Amiability. It was at this point that Mr. and Mrs. Three stopped attending church. Then Mr. Three had a heart attack, further crippling him with debt and depression.

Both the Threes were ashamed when certain church members helped them move from their home. They were also very ashamed, said Mrs. Three, when the church sent them money. To receive money from the church killed their sense of self-esteem. They could not accept the lowered status of "someone who receives money from their church." Mrs. Three was probably more deeply embarrassed by the bankruptcy and the money gift than Mr. Three, who is a fighter in his approach to life.

Peaceful showed lots of loving concern, including visits and phone calls and helping with various needs; but the more concern that was shown, the less the Threes attended. Even though Mr. Three is a hard worker and physically able to work again, and now makes an adequate salary, Mrs. Three says they cannot come to church because they cannot afford the gas to drive the few miles.

The humiliation of the Threes from these factors from outside church, plus the feeling of loss of status when the church helped them so much when they were down and out, substantially contributed toward the emotional depletion of the Threes.

There exists in the minds of the Threes, especially Mrs. Three, the question of whether people believe that incompetency and bad character in her husband might be a possible cause of the failure. Mrs. Three, in phone conversations, continually expressed this suspicion. No matter how genuinely accepting the church members have been, nothing they or this writer have done has overcome the feeling in the Threes that people now look down on them; that they have permanently lost the reputation that they once had; and that they have no way of regaining their former status as important workers in the church. Poverty causing the feeling of lower social status and the feeling of failure has produced so much shame that the Threes do not seem able to overcome it, in spite of the genuine warmth of the church toward this couple and in spite of the fact that they know Peaceful needs Mr. Three to lead the young adults.

Analysis

All three couples indicated that the greatest pain of their shame experiences came because people did not seem to notice or care about their humiliation. As Kaufman says, "Shame begets shame." When other church members saw that these individuals were victims of a humiliating experience, the reaction was to feel shame for them (discomfort in their presence). But this, in turn, increased the feeling of shame of the victims! The victims now felt that there really must be something inadequate or unworthy about their persons to cause

others to avoid them, ignore them, or pretend that the injury was not significant when in fact it was. (The exception was in the case of loss of status.)

It would be an error to conclude that church members did not in fact reach out to the wounded ones. This writer has satisfied himself, through countless conversations with many other church members, that the other church members did reach out. However, the important point is that none of the couples interviewed, not one of the six people, felt that the other church members reached out *enough to re-establish faith and trust again*. Perhaps the key here is that the ones offending them made no public apology, and the church did not demand one. Peaceful seemed to expect each offended couple to forget each incident.

It seems, from listening to these offended people, that there was a period of time immediately following the painful confrontation when they expected others in the church to "right the wrong" and intercede. An apology, a public retraction, or demand by the church for an apology from the person who shamed them — something of this sort was expected.

To hear some of the six interviewed, one would conclude that a steady stream of church members at the front door would have been only right. When this was not forthcoming, when in fact only a "trickle" of five or ten persons came or called, the shame feeling was doubled and quadrupled.

It was as though church inaction was verification that the whole church agreed with and had taken the side of the victim's attacker. In fact, it was this inaction which in every single case was mentioned as what hurt the worst. The reason is obvious: the church inaction was taken by the victims as the agreement of the church that in fact the victim was somehow not worthy of having the offense corrected. *This was felt as a much larger shame than the original offense.*

Particularly, in the worst case, where the pastor cursed the husband and apparently threatened to engage in fisticuffs, the wife recalls with bitterness how none of those in the room did or said anything. This is especially noteworthy because in fact, according to eyewitnesses, several people did say plenty, and one intervened to control the pastor. Yet this was not enough to overcome the sense of injury. In fact, the many efforts to heal relationships with this couple over the years have hardly been felt at all, especially by the wife. The rupture in this case is probably permanent.

All six persons took the TOSCA. (See next chapter.) Both Mr. and Mrs. One, and Mrs. Two, scored high in shame-proneness; Mrs. One was close to one standard deviation above the norm. Mr. Two and Mr. Three scored below average for shame-proneness.

Alpha pride (pride in self as opposed to behavior) in relation to the three couples does not seem to be a significant factor. Of the three couples, all six persons scored only average or below on alpha pride.

Conclusion

In the three cases studied above, shaming incidents were a major factor. The one family which has returned to church was the least shame-prone on average, and the least shamed by the church. The other two families were seriously shamed by the behavior of the church — not demanding a public apology of the cursing pastor, giving money as though to the poor. The Threes, in addition, had a significant shame-related factor, loss of status outside of church life, which strongly influenced their self-concept.

The Ones both had high shame-proneness scores (and low alpha pride scores). The shaming incident for the Ones was so severe that nothing else was needed to precipitate their dropping out.

In the case of the Ones, interpersonal conflict with church members and pastor led to dropping out. In the case of the Twos, the most significant cause of return to church was the resolution of a major shame-based interpersonal conflict with another family member living nearby. The successful expression of autonomy and overcoming shame by Mrs. Two at home caused her to rethink her relationship with the church. With her husband's and her pastor's encouragement, she was able (after one success in expressing autonomy over shame) to return to church.

Finally, in the case of the Threes, the main cause of dropping out was the perception by the Threes that they had lost status due to financial failure. It made no difference that the failure was due to causes not the fault of the Threes. Hard work by church members to regain the Threes made no dent at all. It is quite unclear what action might have helped the Threes overcome their shame. Only improved economic status is likely to rejuvenate this couple.

In conclusion, *shame-proneness, interpersonal conflict with church members, and a perceived loss of status* producing a deep sense of shame are apparently the determining factors in these three cases of church dropouts. These interviews were a guide to inventing the ARSP and also a guide to analyzing and interpreting the results of the statistical tests in the next chapter, chapter six. Finally, these interviews led to the creation of a further interview, in chapter seven, which concentrated on interpersonal conflict in connection with shame-proneness.

CHAPTER SIX

Statistical Measurement: Three Shame-Proneness Tests

Methodology of Measurement

The Null Hypothesis

A null hypothesis was tested at Peaceful UMC and a sister church, Grader's Chapel UMC, seven miles away, using a shame-proneness test, the Test Of Self-Conscious Affect (TOSCA), as the primary instrument of measurement.¹⁶¹ Two other tests were also constructed and administered for purposes of comparison and to attempt to create a test which would predict church attendance. The data from the three tests will be analyzed in the next chapter. The null hypothesis will be stated below after some preliminary explanation.

The question was: will people who attend church less prove to be more susceptible to shame — i.e., be more shame-prone — than those who attend church more? Statistically, the question was whether the frequency of church attendance would covary inversely with the intensity of shame-proneness. The more shame-prone the person, would the attendance of that person go down? The less shame-prone the person, would that person attend more?

Also, a sub-hypothesis was that the covariance would progress smoothly, so that, for example, people who attended only part of the time should fall in the middle on the shame-proneness scale, between regular churchgoers and non-attenders. Put mathematically, shame-proneness and attendance was predicted to covary in a straight line. As one went up, the other was expected to go down.

A null hypothesis was tested. The null hypothesis was that no relationship would be shown to exist between the rankings, at the interval level of

measurement, for shame-proneness and church attendance among the resident members of Peaceful United Methodist Church.

The alternative hypothesis was that a correlation would exist between the independent variable of shame-proneness and the dependent variable of church attendance. A negative correlation, so that the greater the shame-proneness, the less the church attendance, was predicted. The hope, originally, was that a correlation would exist and the null hypothesis could be rejected, but that was not the outcome.

In addition to the main null hypothesis and its alternative hypothesis, a number of other null hypotheses and their corresponding alternative hypotheses were tested. The TOSCA is composed of a number of scales, so for each scale the identical null and alternative hypotheses were tested. The ARSP and the PEABODY scales were tested in the same way.

For example, the null hypotheses for the ARSP were that there would be zero correlation between the ARSP scores and the attendance scores for a) Peaceful UMC alone; b) Grader's Chapel alone; and c) the pairs of scores for Peaceful UMC and Grader's Chapel combined. The corresponding alternative hypotheses would be that there would be significant correlation between the ARSP scores and a), Peaceful UMC alone; b), Grader's Chapel alone; and c) the combined pairs of scores of the two churches.

The data on the x-axis would be the attendance records of all those who responded to the tests. The data on the y-axis would be the scores on the tests. The TOSCA is valid at the interval level of measurement. The attendance data is valid at the ratio level of measurement, so the Pearson correlation coefficient, r , is the proper test of covariance rather than some other test such as the Spearman or chi-square, which measure at a lower level of measurement.

In addition to reporting the correlation coefficient for each variable, the mean (average), standard deviation, A, and B were also reported. (A and B are statistics used to determine the slope of the regression line.) A scattergram was constructed for each variable so that the data could be read visually.

Results are given beginning on page ninety in a table. The significance of the results is shown by the placing of an asterisk (*) by those data which are significant at the 5% and the 1% level for rejection of each null hypothesis.

Limitations Concerning the Hypothesis

Inadequate sample: It was assumed that Peaceful UMC is an inadequate sample for any generalizations to the total population of small rural UMC churches in the United States or to any other group of small rural UMC churches. No random sample of any group of small rural United Methodist Churches was being taken. Therefore no generalizations from the sample to the total population could be made on the basis of the simple test procedure here undertaken.

Limitations of the statistical test: The existence of covariance, as expressed by the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, or as it is better known, r , would not be sufficient to indicate a causal relationship. In other words, supposing that r did show a clear correlation, so that church attendance was seen to decrease as a person scored higher on the shame-proneness scale, then this mere correlation would still not be adequate to establish causality.¹⁶² Rather, it indicates a basis for further study of causality.

By simply squaring the Pearson r , one does get the coefficient of determination (r^2), which gives the percent of the total population which could be predicted (caused) by the test results. Normally, this value would be very

small, and in fact it was so small with the results gotten that it was not reported.

The unexpected happened and it was discovered that the correlation coefficient was very low, and there existed no correlation at any level of significance. This was even more significant (in reverse) than if correlation had been established, since it is usually so that when two variables do not covary, then neither can be said to cause the other directly. It meant that shame-proneness would have been found almost certainly not to cause nonattendance directly in any measure, although it might be a factor in combination with other factors.

The test was limited, though being the only test indicated, in making a determination of any causative relationship between attendance and shame-proneness. Nevertheless, the testing was done to see what it would in fact show in the way of correlation. The TOSCA has a number of variables. It was hoped that one of them would covary significantly with attendance; if not shame-proneness, then something related to shame. However, none of them did.

Multiple causative factors: It is highly likely, if not certain, that there is in fact a multiplicity of factors causing church nonattendance. It is far beyond the scope of this dissertation to attempt to discover them using statistical methods. Such a work could take a lifetime. Furthermore, statistics are limited in their reach as a means of discovery in such a matter. Accordingly, it was planned from the beginning that other methods of observation in addition to statistical measurement would be used.

Statistical Testing Instruments

The TOSCA: The total resident membership of the church was asked to take a test for shame-proneness; the TOSCA (Test of Self-Conscious Affect),¹⁶³ was used. The TOSCA has an established reliability and validity, published in a

professional journal, so that there is some assurance that the construct, shame-proneness, was actually being measured.¹⁶⁴ The TOSCA is reliable at the interval level, which is satisfactory since an interval level of measurement is all that is needed for a comparison between attendance and shame-proneness. Attendance data is at a higher, ratio level,¹⁶⁵ and therefore the TOSCA can be used appropriately to determine the Pearson correlation coefficient, since the data for both the x- and y-axis is at the interval level or above.

The TOSCA, a sample of which is found in the Appendix, has fifteen questions. Each question has four or five sub-questions to be answered using a Likert scale. The total number of questions in the TOSCA is 64.¹⁶⁶

The TOSCA measures shame-proneness (S), guilt-proneness (G), detachment (D), externalization (E), alpha pride (Al), and beta pride (Be).¹⁶⁷ The detachment scale measures the tendency of the subject to blame neither self nor others, but rather circumstances, for anxiety-generating incidents. The externalization scale measures the tendency of the subject to blame others rather than self. The guilt scale measures the subject's tendency to act quickly to correct or alleviate any suffering or injustice suffered by another in anxiety-generating incidents.

The alpha pride scale measures "bad" pride, the feeling that the cause of an accomplishment is one's own superior personality, appearance, or identity rather than any objective work or effort put forth. The beta pride scale measures "good" pride, or satisfaction with one's own efforts and accomplishments from a less egotistical point of view. Finally, the shame scale measures the tendency of the subject to feel that something inherently wrong or bad inside the self is the cause of any anxiety.

ARSP: The second test was ten questions of the writer's own construction, called the Attendance-Related Shame-Proneness Test (ARSP). (See the Appendix for the questions.) The ARSP was constructed intuitively with shame-proneness and church conflict in mind. It asks questions about feelings of having been humiliated in church. The ARSP was devised in hopes of developing a simple test for discovering those church members at risk for dropping out of church. No validity coefficient in predicting nonattendance was established. The ARSP correlated well with nonattendance, however. (See pages 90-91.)

PEABODY: The third and final test, called here the Peabody, was devised from an eighty-four question survey constructed ten years ago by Rev. Joe Pittman Peabody.¹⁶⁸ The Peabody consists of ten questions, chosen by this writer from Rev. Peabody's survey of congregational attitudes for his doctoral dissertation. The questions were picked partly on the basis of their appearing to measure the subject's satisfaction with other church members, and partly because they seemed to measure shame-proneness. Devised as a backup to the ARSP, the Peabody also correlated significantly with nonattendance. (See pages 90-91.)

Ethics in Testing Procedures

The Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education was adhered to in the test taking procedure as much as possible, especially relating to ethical questions.¹⁶⁹ For example, each resident member was promised that he or she would be informed of the general overall results of the testing in a letter after the tests had been collected and analyzed.

Testing Procedure

Taking Attendance: Attendance was taken on 27 Sundays at both churches over a period of nearly a year. From October 12, 1986, to January 11, 1987, and

again from September 2, 1990, through November 25, 1990, attendance was taken at both Peaceful UMC and Grader's Chapel UMC.

Peaceful UMC: On January 31, 1991, packets containing the three tests and a cover letter¹⁷⁰ were mailed to 47 resident members whose attendance was low or nonexistent. The remaining 42 resident members, whose attendance records were better, were expected to be there the following Sunday, February 3, to receive their packets. The rest were mailed on February 4. This made a total of 89 resident members, the total population of resident members of Peaceful UMC, who received packets. Of these 89, 48 responded (55.81%). Actually, the response was higher, but one had to be thrown out because the man had not joined the church during attendance taking, and had no attendance record since he was not coming during that time. Another response came from a person in a nursing home, and since the attendance was not free to vary, her response had to be thrown out. Every single resident member, with the exception of one person who was in the hospital in Intensive Care with a brain-debilitating stroke, was presented with a packet. Consultation with Dr. Tangney by phone confirmed the appropriateness of excluding the above respondents for statistical purposes.

No constituent members were tested, which left out several persons who attend regularly. A person had to be on the roll to get a packet. This meant that several regular attenders who were constituent members did not receive a packet of tests, because their names were not on the official membership roll. The criterion of resident membership was adhered to rigidly.

Grader's Chapel: Also on January 31, 1991, the same procedure was followed with Peaceful's sister church, Grader's Chapel UMC. Packets were mailed to 12 resident members whose attendance was poor; the remaining 37 packets were delivered in church on February 3. The rest were mailed on February 4, making a

total of 49 resident members sent packets. This was the total population of resident members of Grader's Chapel UMC. A total of 30 persons answered.

Just as at Peaceful, the criterion of resident membership was adhered to without exception. A woman in bed at home under home nursing care, too sick to stand due to a disintegrating spine, received her packet, as did her husband, who was in the hospital for observation as a possible victim of tuberculosis. He was too weak to lift his head to read or lift his hand to hold a pen, but he got a packet just the same. (They did not respond; if they had, their responses would have had to be thrown out since their attendance could not vary.)

Also, several regular attenders who have not yet gotten around to joining the church at Grader's Chapel did not get a packet. They were not resident members, and so did not qualify. A woman who belongs to the church, however, and who has not attended in five years although she lives less than a mile from church, got her packet by mail. She responded and her data is in the pool. One boy, aged 14, a preparatory member, was excluded from the membership list even though there is some confusion in his parents' minds as to his membership standing. They view him as already a member of the church, though in fact he has not yet taken the vows. He did not fill out the test.

It is not intended that the above paragraphs be humorous, although they have their humorous side. The above information is intended to convey that the population tested was the whole population of resident members in each case, for statistical purposes.

Responses received: Thirty persons from Grader's Chapel UMC and forty-eight persons from Peaceful UMC responded, for a total of seventy-eight usable responses. Several persons had trouble taking the TOSCA. They all made the same

error. They thought they were to choose only one action, either a, b, c, d, or e, for each of the fifteen situations. They did not respond to all the letters.

However, the instructions in the TOSCA asked the subjects to make a response to each action, responding to all: a, b, c, d, and e. In each case, the person was willing to take the test back and finish answering it. These tests were treated the same as those tests in which persons followed directions correctly.

Questions Asking for Comment

The following two questions came at the end of the questionnaire:

1. In your own words, what are some of the reasons you might miss worship services at your church? (Feel free to use the back.)
2. In your own words, what do you feel is the main reason you skip worship services at your church? (Feel free to use the back.)

Analysis of Statistical Measurement

After receiving the questionnaires from the church members, around the end of March, 1991, the results were calculated as follows:

Calculation of Results at Peaceful UMC Alone¹⁷¹

	ATT	S	D	G	E	Al	Be	AR	PE	AR+PE	Al+Be
	0-	15-	10-	14-	15-	5-	4-	10-	10-	20-	9-
Range	100	75	50	70	75	25	20	50		100	45
Mean	41.3	43.5	28.89	55.5	41.1	17.4	15.6	22.6	22.7	45.3	33.0
StD	34.4	9.1	7.1	7.1	9.0	3.6	2.2	8.4	6.1	13.6	5.1
r	NA	-.15	-.05	-.304	.15	-.07	-.231	-.313**	-.371**	-.144	-.16
A	NA	45.2	29.3	58.1	39.5	17.8	16.2	25.7	25.4	51.2	33.98
B	NA	-.04	-.01	-.06	.04	-.01	-.02	-.08	-.07	-.14	-.02

* = significant at 5% level ($r < -.285$)

** = significant at 1% level ($r < -.368$)

df = 46

Calculation of Results for Grader's Chapel Alone

	ATT	S	D	G	E	Al	Be	AR	PE	AR+PE	Al+Be
	0-	15-	10-	14-	15-	5-	4-	10-	10-	20-	9-
Range	100	75	50	70	75	25	20	50		100	45
Mean	59.6	42.7	32.3	54.8	42.3	17.6	14.7	15.8	18.1	33.97	32.4
StD	23.3	10.4	6.8	7.2	8.2	.8	2.1	4.9	3.1	7.1	4.7
r	NA	.130	-.142	.073	.264	-.306	-.310	.076	.005	.054	-.329
A	NA	39.2	34.8	53.5	36.7	19.9	16.4	14.9	18.1	32.98	36.3
B	NA	.06	-.04	.02	.09	-.04	-.03	.02	.001	.02	-.07

* = significant at 5% level ($r < -.361$)

** = significant at 1% level ($r < -.463$)

df = 28

Calculation of Results for Peaceful UMC and Grader's Chapel UMC Combined

	ATT	S	D	G	E	Al	Be	AR	PE	AR+PE	Al+Be
	0-	15-	10-	14-	15-	5-	4-	10-	10-	20-	9-
Range	100	75	50	70	75	25	20	50		100	45
Mean	48.4	43.2	30.2	55.2	41.5	17.5	15.3	20.0	20.9	40.1	33.8
StD	31.9	.7	.2	7.2	8.8	3.3	2.2	8.0	5.6	12.8	5.0
r	NA	-.07	-.01	-.20	.19	-.12	-.289*	-.321**	-.378**	-.366**	-.21
A	NA	44.2	30.3	57.3	39.0	18.1	16.3	23.8	24.1	48.0	34.4
B	NA	-.02	-.001	-.04	.05	-.01	-.02	-.08	-.07	-.15	-.03

* = significant at 5% level ($r < -.223$)

** = significant at 1% level ($r < -.291$)

df = 76

* Key to Abbreviations:

A = Constant value, used to determine the slope of regression.

Al = Alpha pride scale, TOSCA

Al+Be = Alpha pride score plus Beta pride score, TOSCA

AR = Attendance-Related Shame-Proneness scale, by Wallace Cason

AR+PE = AR scores plus PE scores

ATT = Attendance scores. The number represents percent of perfect attendance.

B = Coefficient of regression, used in combination with A to determine slope.

Responses to the Questions

Each slash / indicates one response in the lists given below.

Answers to the First Question

"What are some of the reasons you might miss worship...?"

Grader's Chapel Reasons for Missing Worship

Babysitting Grandchildren — ///	Illness of Family — /////-/
Bad Weather — ///	Laziness — ///
Company Came — /////-///	One Sunday Won't Matter — /
Death of Loved One — ///	Out of the Habit — /
Driving at Night Dangerous — /	Out of Town — /////-///
Emergencies — /	Overslept — ///
Family Events — ///	Rowdy Children — /
Family Problems — //	Vacations and Visiting — /////-
Feeling Poorly — //	///// -//
Homework — /	Weddings — /
Illness of Self — /////-///// -///// -///// -	Work — /
///	

It is noteworthy that not one person at Grader's Chapel put as a reason for missing church that they were angry or had been embarrassed by someone or something at church. The reasons had little or nothing to do with other church members, but rather primarily to do with personal activities.

Peaceful UMC Reasons for Missing Worship

Babysitting Grandchildren — /	Don't Feel Close to People — /
Bad Weather — ///	Didn't Feel Like Going — //Don't
Cleaning House — /	Like Way Service Is Run — //
Company Comes — /////-//	Embarrassment, Personal Situations
Death of Loved One — //	— /

Be = Beta pride scale, TOSCA
 D = Detached scale, TOSCA
 E = Externalization scale, TOSCA
 G = Guilt scale, TOSCA
 Mean = Arithmetic average
 NA = Not Applicable
 PE = Peabody scale, from Joe Peabody, by Wallace Cason
 r = Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient
 S = Shame-proneness scale, TOSCA
 StD = Standard Deviation of the Sample σ_n

Embarrassment, Church Situations — /	No Transportation — / Old Age —
Fishing — /	///// -
Hunting — //	Out of the Habit — /
Husband Home — /	Out of Town — ///// -
Illness of Family — //	People in Church — /
Illness of Self — ///// - ///// - ///// - ///// -	Prior Commitments — //
/	Recreation — /
Involved With Another Church — /	Service at 9:30 AM Too Early — /
Lack of Association with Church People — /	Stayed up Late Saturday Night —
Lack of Self-Discipline — //	//
Laziness — //	Tired of Fighting Church People —
Problems with Family — /	/
Problems with Money — //	Too Tired — ///// - /
Problems with Work — /	Unexpected Things Come Up — /
Never Been Made Welcome — /	Vacation — //
No Money for Offering — /	Visiting Others — //
No One Will Miss Me — /	Weekend Work — ///// - /////

It is immediately noted that there is a larger number of reasons, and a different type of reason coming out of the list from Peaceful UMC. The reasons are vaguer: for example, "unexpected things," "prior commitments," and "don't feel like going." Also, there are more reasons connected with conflict with persons at church: for example, "no one will miss me," "tired of fighting church people," "don't like way worship is conducted," and "embarrassment over church situations."

Answers to the Second Question

"What is Your Main Reason for Missing Church?"

Grader's Chapel Main Reasons for Missing Church

Commitment to God Is Lacking — /	No Excuse — //
Company Comes — //	No Church Nursery — /
Death of Loved One — /	No Transportation — /
Don't Try Hard Enough — /	Not Christian I Should Be — /
Family Reunion — //	
Illness of Family — ///// -	Out of Town — //
Illness of Self — ///// - ///// - //	Visiting Others — //
Just Didn't Want To Come — /	Work on Weekend — /
Lazy — //	

Peaceful UMC Main Reasons for Missing Church

Bad Weather — ///	No One Will Miss Me — /
Company Came — ///	No Transportation — //
Don't Like Way Service Is Run — /	Nothing to Offer Me — /
Hunting or Fishing — /	Old Age — //
Illness of Family — ///	Other Obligations — /
Illness of Self — /////-///// -///// -	Out of the Habit — //
Lazy — //	Out of Town — //
Little Things Pop Up — /	People Don't Seem to Care — ///
Money Problems — /	People Make Me Uncomfortable — /
Need Time For Myself — /	Service 9:30 Too Early — ///
Need Time With Spouse — ///	Too Tired — ///
Never Been Made Welcome — /	Vacation — //
No Money for Offering — /	Visiting Family — /
No One My Age — /	Work on Weekends — ///

One can see by the list above for Peaceful UMC that the "main reasons" are much more involved with bad personal relationships with persons at church: "Don't like the way the service is run," "Never been made welcome," "No one will miss me," "Nothing to offer me," "People don't seem to care," "People make me uncomfortable". These types of reasons are qualitatively different from, for example, "Not the Christian I ought to be." There is a lot of blaming of others for one's nonattendance at Peaceful UMC. The blaming of others corroborates other evidence that there is low self-esteem at Peaceful UMC; it was established earlier that blaming is one way to ease feelings of personal inadequacy or humiliation, dealing with one's inner shame response by behaving as a "skunk" (showing anger and blame) or as a "turtle" (being angry at oneself and blaming oneself).¹⁷²

Results of the Attendance-Related Shame-Proneness (ARSP) and the Peabody Tests

A look in the Appendix will show that both the ARSP and the Peabody tests are primarily tests of dissatisfaction over interpersonal conflict. Both tests successfully correlated with low attenders, as was reported in the statistical results above.

The Peabody tested primarily for hurt feelings, loss of faith in God, and feeling rejected by the congregation. The ARSP was more related to shame-proneness; each of its questions tested some aspect of shame-proneness, in a church-related way. Although it is satisfying that both of these tests correlated negatively with attendance, fitting predictions, they are not constructed scientifically. They are based on intuition only, and are with untested validity.

The lack of corroboration by the TOSCA shame scale makes the results of the ARSP and Peabody suspect as measures of shame-proneness; yet, if they do turn out to have any validity, it will probably be because they test for interpersonal conflict with others in a church's congregation — which the TOSCA does not. As will be seen in the analysis below, interpersonal conflict appears more and more as a major factor in dropping out of church, especially for women.

These tests did not scientifically prove anything; however, they do both point to the probability that interpersonal conflict with church members is a contributing factor in nonattendance, especially when shame-proneness is present.

Absence of Negative Correlation Between Shame Scale and Attendance

The null hypothesis, that there would be no relationship between the shame scale of the TOSCA and church attendance, was proven. This means that the actual expected result of a negative correlation between shame and attendance was denied. The conclusion is that there is no correlation between shame and attendance. Put another way, it cannot be assumed that a person is staying away from church because of shame-proneness, or that a shame-prone person would miss church (or come to church) more than a person who was not shame-prone, on the basis of that one factor of shame-proneness alone.

Yet intuition and experience still lead one to suspect a relationship between shame-proneness and nonattendance. Why did shame-proneness not correlate more with attendance? Logically, the possibilities might be:

- 1) People hid their true level of shame-proneness; i.e., an inadequate test;
- 2) The test measured correctly, and people simply do not skip church based on shame-proneness alone;
- 3) Shame-proneness is only one factor and only becomes a factor in nonattendance when some other missing factor or factors, like alpha pride, personality conflicts, or other elements are added.

The second and third possibilities were believed to be the case; accordingly, investigation continued in the direction of finding additional factors which might, in combination, yield nonattendance.

Shame-Proneness and Alpha Pride

Alpha pride was considered as a possible combinative factor. June Price Tangney observed, in recent studies, that there was no positive correlation between shame-proneness and alpha pride (feelings of pride in the entire self, as opposed to beta pride, feelings of pride in behavior), though men tend to have more alpha pride than women.¹⁷³ The present study, using the same test, the TOSCA, gave the same result. For Grader's Chapel, Pearson's r was .15, while for Peaceful UMC, r was .05; the combined r was .08. This was the same as saying alpha pride and shame are independent of each other; if a person has one, this is no guarantee that they will have the other. However, even though they may be independent of each other, they might still have a combined effect.

The question then was asked: how do the shame-proneness scale scores, plus the alpha pride scores, together correlate against attendance scores? This led to the following result:

Attendance vs. S scale + A scale: Grader's Chapel and Peaceful had entirely different mathematical results. Grader's Chapel, using only those scores

which were above average for the S and A scale, showed a high positive correlation, with a Pearson's r of $+0.322$ out of 11 people with above average scores (above the Grader's Chapel total of an average alpha score of 17.6 plus an average shame score of 42.7 equals 60.3). Peaceful, on the other hand, showed a significant negative correlation, with a Pearson's r of -0.222 out of 30 people with above average scores (above the Peaceful average alpha and shame score of 60.9). One church correlates positively with shame-proneness, while the other church correlates negatively. What could explain such a disparity?

The two churches are very different. Grader's Chapel has a history of standing united against other churches, with no history of internal fighting and no history of persons dropping out due to embarrassment or conflict. Peaceful, on the other hand, has a terrible record of internal fighting, while giving in to the demands of other churches, most notably Grader's Chapel twenty years ago.

The conclusion was that perhaps a look just at those who had dropped out completely might yield some insight. In other words, instead of looking for a correlation of shame-proneness with attenders, a study would be made of the correlation of shame-proneness only with those who had at one time or another totally dropped out. Since none had totally dropped out at Grader's Chapel, only Peaceful would be considered. The study of shame-proneness of church dropouts from Peaceful began to yield results.

Comparison of Scores of Peaceful Church Dropouts

Looking at seventeen persons from Peaceful UMC who had totally dropped out of activity at Peaceful due to humiliating incidents or angry conflicts, not only were their shame-proneness (S) scores above average (44.1 as compared with the average of 43.5); but also their alpha pride scores were above average (17.8 as compared with the average of 17.4). Yet the scores were not significantly

above average, taking men and women together. It was decided to divide the results by sex.

Analysis suggested that there did seem to be a sex factor. Of those who had dropped out, the average shame score of the 7 men was only 40.14, below average, while the average shame score of the 10 women was 46.8, which is 3.3 points above average. Thus, the dropped out women had higher shame scores than the dropped out men.

Just as interesting was the result for the alpha scores of church dropouts. The men had an average alpha score of 18.1, .3 points above average, while the women had an average alpha score of 17.5, .3 points below average. Thus the women were more shame-prone and the men were more prone to alpha pride. In fact, one man had an alpha pride score of 25, which is a perfect score.

It will be remembered that the ARSP and the Peabody seemed to indicate that interpersonal conflict might be a factor. At this point a further element was considered: who, of the dropouts, had been engaged in interpersonal conflict before dropping out?

Conflict and Dropouts

Looking just at those eleven people who dropped out because of interpersonal conflict, the data jump out even bolder. The alpha pride scores, only just above average, are not very interesting: the five men scored an average of 17.6 on the alpha pride scale, or .2 above average, while the women scored 17.5, or .1 above average. But the shame scores grab the attention.

A possible finding — conflicted dropout women had higher shame-proneness: The five men scored an average of only 40 on the shame scale, while the conflicted dropout women's average shame-proneness score was 49.3, which is getting close to one standard deviation above the average ($43.5 + 9.1 = 52.6$).

In fact, the women's score of 49.3 is 9.3 points, which is in fact one full standard deviation (9.1), higher than the men's average score of 40 on the shame scale.

Thus, when looking just at the data for dropouts due to incidents of interpersonal conflict, it was discovered that *of those who dropped out due to interpersonal conflict, the dropout women have significantly higher shame scores than dropout men*. The shame-proneness scores of the conflicted dropout men were 3.5 points below average. It is tempting to conclude that when people drop out of church due to interpersonal conflict, expect the women to be the primary cause, and expect those women to be high in shame-proneness.

Therefore, perhaps it can be said that *totally dropping out of church correlates significantly with interpersonal conflict, shame-proneness, and gender*. It would take further studies with a larger population to arrive at any significant conclusion from a statistical point of view. It is possible that the above is only a manipulation. However, in light of other evidence presented in this dissertation, this writer does not think so.

Are women more responsible for dropping out? Of the six couples, it was the women in every single case who, according to witnesses, were responsible for the couple dropping out of church. The pastor can verify that in three of the six cases, it was without a doubt the woman who was responsible. In the larger group of seventeen dropouts including those who did not drop out because of conflict (eight married couples minus one husband for whom there is no data, plus two single women), six of the ten women are known by the pastor to be primarily responsible for the couple's dropping out, while only two of the seven men is known to be primarily responsible.

That women feel shame more quickly, profoundly, and with longer lasting effects is borne out in the investigation reported in chapter five. The wives suffered not only their own shame, but in each of the three cases suffered the shame of their husbands as well. In two of the three cases, the husbands say that if it were not for the wife still feeling hurt, they would return. It is most revealing that all three wives in the cases of chapter five said point blank that they had suffered much more humiliation than their husbands.

Most dropouts can still be won back: The conflicted dropout population consisted of five couples and one extra woman. The sixth dropout woman filled out the form for her husband, and so no data were obtained for him. It is interesting that of the six couples, four of the couples now frequently attend church. This writer thinks he helped win back three of the couples; the fourth couple came back on its own and is highly thought of by the entire church. That fourth couple no longer is interested in church leadership. They have a new, happy, quiet spirit, which, interestingly enough, they developed while dropouts.

Conclusion

From the data, neither shame-proneness nor alpha pride could be said to correlate negatively with church attendance, but high shame-proneness is strongly evident in women who both experienced severe interpersonal conflict and who dropped out of church.

It also appears that a positive church personality, such as that of Grader's Chapel, can totally negate any tendency — if one exists — for persons high in both shame-proneness and alpha pride to drop out. However, where there is a negative church personality, those persons with both high shame-proneness and high alpha pride are at risk for dropping out. Also, it is not known what effect a severe interpersonal conflict would have on a positive church personal-

ity, and this writer does not think a generalization can be made owing to the great diversity that exists in church populations.

The data might be interpreted to indicate that high shame-proneness in women, plus high alpha pride in their husbands, plus interpersonal conflict, puts such a couple at very high risk for dropping out of church. When shame-proneness was above the mean, it did correlate negatively with attendance. In chapter two, it was established that studies show shame-prone men are more likely to act out while shame-prone women are more likely to blame others.

Also, it can be expected that conflicted dropout women will be significantly higher in shame-proneness than dropout men, and higher than the average church member. Paradoxically, putting dropout men and women together, their scores for alpha pride and shame were only average. This is due to the low average alpha pride scores of dropout women and the low average shame scores of men, and the high average alpha pride scores of dropout men and the high average shame scores of dropout women, which make the final combined male and female scores come out average. Further studies will be necessary if these results are to be verified.

In conclusion, the factors for dropping out (not just lower attendance), based on chapter five, seemed to be interpersonal conflict and the perception of loss of status. The factors for dropping out, based on the tests in this chapter, seem to be: interpersonal conflict, shame-proneness, and gender. Two main conclusions were reached from the statistics: 1) that *of those who dropped out due to interpersonal conflict, the dropout women have significantly higher shame scores than dropout men*; and 2) that *totally dropping out of church correlates significantly with interpersonal conflict, shame-proneness, and gender*.

CHAPTER SEVEN

The Investigation Continues:

A Questionnaire for Shame Overcomers

Introduction and Rationale

Up to this point, the interviews in chapter five and the statistical tests in chapter six had pointed to several possible factors in nonattendance: gender, shame-proneness, perceived loss of status, and most important, interpersonal conflict with other church members. Evidence seems to indicate that when shame-proneness is linked with interpersonal conflict, there is a high risk of church dropouts; but with no conflict, shame-proneness does not cause low attendance. It was discovered that there may be a significant difference between reasons for low attendance and reasons for dropping out altogether: shame-proneness seemed to relate much more to dropping out, and not to lower attendance.

However, as a result of discovering the absence of correlation of shame-proneness as measured by the TOSCA with low attendance, the thought arose: what reasons for attendance would be given by highly shame-prone people who nevertheless attend church with great frequency? The answers might inform pastors as to how to win back shame-prone dropouts.

Mailing A Second Questionnaire

A questionnaire was mailed, therefore, to persons high in shame-proneness and also high in church attendance. It was a questionnaire that assumed interpersonal conflict over shame-based issues had occurred, but had been overcome. The questionnaire probed for the reasons these shame-prone people had been able to overcome any interpersonal conflict.

On Saturday, April 13, 1991, twenty-one questionnaires were mailed to a select group of resident church members from the two churches, Peaceful UMC and Grader's Chapel UMC (fictitious names). For a person to be included, the sum of what a person scored on attendance and shame-proneness, as measured by the Test of Self-Conscious Affect, had to be 120 or above. Persons who were above average in either attendance or shame-proneness, or both, were selected for study. Few were below average in either attendance or shame-proneness.

One might think of this group as shame overcomers, since it was theorized that these shame-prone persons had to overcome their desires to withdraw, brought about by their feelings of shame, in order to have such high attendance scores.

Procedure

Picking the respondents: The highest score possible for attendance was 100; the highest score possible for shame-proneness was 75. The writer wanted a relatively large number of responses. Since to choose only those persons who scored above one standard deviation from the mean on both scores would have meant that only one person would have qualified, the writer more realistically decided to accept persons with scores lower than one standard deviation above the mean, simply for the sake of getting a sufficient quantity of responses.

First, a cut-off of 120 for the sum of the two scores was reached based on "eyeballing" the scores. This number seemed to be low enough to give a fair number of respondees, yet high enough to make the cut-off for either score higher than average. This was all that was needed for the purpose.

The mean score for attendance for both churches combined was 48.4. One standard deviation above 48.4 would have been 80.3. Although not so high as 80.3, no attendance score below 64 was chosen. The mean attendance score among

the twenty-one subjects was 82.7, which is significant, being more than one standard deviation above the total population mean.

The mean score for shame-proneness for both churches combined was 43.2. One standard deviation above 43.2 would have been 52.9. Although not so high as 52.9, for the second questionnaire no shame-proneness score below 36 was chosen. (This turned out to be perhaps a mistake, including persons with shame scores so low; possibly this was a reason for such a low return on the questionnaires.) Nevertheless, the mean shame-proneness score among the twenty-one subjects was a fairly high 48.5, which was judged to be sufficiently close to 52.9, i.e. to one standard deviation above the total population mean, for the purpose here, finding a group with both high attendance and shame-proneness.

By joining the attendance and shame-proneness scores, so that the total acceptable score had to be 120 or higher, those persons were selected who were exceptionally high in either attendance or shame-proneness. For a person with a shame-proneness score of 36 to be included, the attendance score had to be at least 84, since the total score must be 120 or higher. For a person whose attendance score was only 64 (the lowest), the shame-proneness score would have had to be 56 or higher.

An Interesting Sidelight: For This Group, Pearson's $r = -.608$: It is of some interest that the Pearson's correlation coefficient just for these twenty-one individuals, between shame-proneness and attendance, was $r = -.608$, which is significant at the 1% level by a substantial bit,¹⁷⁴ and which is about double any other correlation found in the first study in chapter six. It is also of interest that the correlation is negative rather than positive. At last — a group that "proved" the original hypothesis was on track!

It might be concluded that when either attendance or shame-proneness is high, then there is a significant negative statistical correlation with attendance: i.e., as higher attendance goes up, higher shame-proneness will tend to go down; and as higher shame-proneness goes up, higher attendance will tend to go down, so that higher shame-proneness and higher attendance covary negatively. The coefficient of determination, r^2 , would be .37, which is quite large and means that about 37% of the time, higher scores of attendance and shame-proneness can be predicted to covary negatively. Another significant finding? More studies would need to be done to determine that.

The Questions on the Second Questionnaire

Every person was assured of the confidential nature of the questionnaire. The test was constructed and mailed so that the writer would not know to whom each questionnaire belonged. The writer's own return address was given on the self-addressed stamped envelopes enclosed with the questionnaires. Questions were asked which would explore how the persons viewed themselves. Each question will be seen and evaluated in the section below.

First, the respondees were asked to rank themselves for shame-proneness. This would give an indication of whether they were conscious of their shame-proneness. They were asked to give examples of shaming incidents in their own church lives and the church lives of others. They were asked to list reasons why they kept coming to church even though they had a tendency to feel humiliated or embarrassed. And they were asked for the most important reason they kept coming in spite of the shame incidents. Ten different types of humiliation were listed in a box in the test, so that it would be clear what was being asked for.

Results of the Second Questionnaire

Twenty-one questionnaires were sent out on April 13, 1991. Eleven people responded, for a response percentage of 52.4%. Not every person who sent back a form filled it out completely. For this reason, the number of responses to each question will differ from the total number of persons responding.

Why was the response so low? After all, each of the twenty-one had filled out the first questionnaire. Each of the twenty-one has a good relationship with the pastor, and is a high church attender — a "pillar of the church." The expectation was for 100% of the forms to be returned. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were provided. Total anonymity was also a key ingredient of this second questionnaire. Yet only 52.4%, eleven persons, responded; and two of the eleven responded only to send a note saying they could not answer the questionnaire! Considering the high degree of involvement of these persons in church, 52.4% must be viewed as a relatively low response. The impression is that the low response is shame-related.

The exact reason for the 52.4% response will never be known. However, the suspicion is that: 1) the questionnaire was extremely difficult for shame-prone persons because of the subject matter of the questions — shameful incidents; and 2) the methodology of using a questionnaire is insufficient to overcome reluctance to discuss really shameful matters. (A pastoral visit and interview might have elicited more information, but privacy would have been invaded.)

See the Appendix for a look at the entire questionnaire exactly as it appeared as sent out. The first question was:

1. On a scale of one to ten, how easy is it for others to make you feel humiliated or ashamed or offended (angry) when someone snubs you, insults you, humiliates you, criticizes you, gossips about you, or ignores you? (Not what you show to others, but what you really feel inside?) If you circle the one, it would mean you have a very thick skin; circling the ten would mean you have a really thin skin. Please circle the number below that usually describes you best:

(not hurt) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (very hurt)

Responses to Question One

The numbers circled were: 3,3,3,4,1,5,1. No response was given on three of the returned questionnaires.

Analysis of Responses to Question One

A very low mean score: People either were far less shame-prone than the TOSCA showed them to be, or else they were so affected by shame that they were denying / repressing the feeling. On a scale of one to ten, the mean TOSCA shame-proneness score of the twenty-one persons chosen was 5.6;¹⁷⁵ however, when left to judge themselves on "embarrassability," the seven people responding to question one had an average score of only 2.86!

Repression suspected: It is a reasonable assumption that the respondees were repressing their shame-proneness, since it would have made them feel ashamed to admit how easily shamed they are. Therefore they estimated themselves to be a 2 or 3 on a scale of one to ten, rather than the true 5 or 6.

It is especially indicative of repression or some similar psychological process of denial, self-deceit or self-protection that none of the respondees scored themselves higher than a 5, yet out of the twenty-one sent the test there

should have been several choosing for themselves much higher numbers on the scale, based on their TOSCA shame-proneness scores.

The second question was:

2. We all have had things happen to us in church which cause us to feel that others are showing contempt for us, are not considering our feelings, or are not showing us normal and proper respect. Can you give an example of this kind of incident which might happen at church to cause you or someone else embarrassment? (Look at the top of the next page for help in remembering.)

Responses to Question Two

The answers given were as follows. When several people made the same basic response, subletters were used. The subletters following each number are used to group responses with the same general idea:

1. Someone would go to the other end of the pew instead of sitting by me.
2. No one would call about events or ask me to help with events.
3. Someone would give me orders or not give me a choice in a matter.
4. Can't think of any.
5. I have experienced no embarrassment at church; nobody has criticized or offended me in any way.
6. I have lived here five years but still feel like an outsider.
7.
 - a. Someone would not consult or consider me in making decisions.
 - b. Not being included in important decisions.
8. One person hurt me about Sunday School.
9. People forgetting to speak.
10. Our food at a church meeting was scarce.
11. Our church was not as clean as it should be during a meeting.
12. I am not easy to notice things like this.
13. Someone else might be better for the job than I am.
14. I am easy for my feelings to get hurt.

Analysis of Responses to Question Two

Not answering the question: Two persons were confused by question 2. They answered with responses such as, "Enjoy the services and love all the people," "I love Tranquil and my preacher," and so on. Such Pollyanna responses

were expected but are not included above. (For Pollyanna responses see chapter three.)

This couldn't be for me!: Additionally, two other persons returned blank questionnaires with notes. One person, with a shame-proneness score of 49, said "I really don't know what you are talking about and it really upset me." The confusion fits with shame-proneness. Another, with a high attendance score but a TOSCA shame-proneness score of only 43 (which was within a fraction of the mean for the total population) said, "I can't answer these questions because I don't think they pertain to me." She might have been right. Her shaming incidents all probably came from home, not from church.

More evidence of repression: Considering the TOSCA shame scores of these individuals, and excepting the persons with closer to average shame-proneness scores, there are only two logical explanations for the above data: either the TOSCA does not measure shame-proneness, or these persons are living proof of the power of repression to keep persons from even being conscious of their shame-based feelings. The high shame-proneness scores coupled with such strong denial and upset probably does indicate a high degree of emotional suffering.

Nothing significant was gained from asking question two, except to corroborate question one in uncovering the fact that quite a few shame-prone people either do not know they are shame-prone or do not want to admit it to themselves and others. Not all denied it, however.

The types of shaming incidents elicited were indeed the expected. There is no doubt that shame-prone individuals do indeed experience shaming incidents in church.

The third question was:

3. What has actually happened to you like the above to cause you to feel humiliated?

Responses to Question Three

The answers given were as follows:

1. Someone gave me a rap on the hand that scared me. I hoped no one noticed.
2. I don't feel capable of being a Sunday School leader. I don't do a good job.
3. I don't feel that I pay enough personal attention to the sick.
4. a. Some things another person did that caused me embarrassment for them and brings back bad memories.
- b. Some little thing I did that others saw that embarrassed me that I wish I could erase.
6. N A (Probably meaning "not applicable")
7. Group or in some cases families making suggestions and decisions that will not do and so many will not stand up or say no.
8. a. Nothing that I can't forgive and forget.
- b. I have been hurt at church but I try to forgive and forget and not hold a grudge (that makes you feel better)
9. About Sunday School.
10. Some people got mad at preacher and stopped coming.
11. I don't think anything about people not speaking to me.
12. I don't carry my feelings around with me.
13. Most of all I would pray for them to learn better.
14. It seems you have to speak first to some people.

Analysis of Responses to Question Three

Vagueness: One thing that immediately stands out about the responses is vagueness. The respondees are not willing, even in an identity-protected questionnaire, to reveal specifically what shamed them. They answer only in a vague, general way. The last three responses do not even answer the question!

Confusing guilt and shame: The person who made response 3. above seemed to have confused guilt with shame. This is in line with the psychological theory that a person will substitute a less painful emotion (in this case, guilt) to cover up a more painful one (in this case, some unidentified shame).

Denial: The responses in numbers 11, 12, and 13 were made by the same person. One can see easily that there is denial. Response 13 gives the lie to responses 11 and 12. The very way 11 and 12 are worded indicate this person is indeed, notwithstanding the denial, bothered by "people not speaking to me" and by the burden of "carrying my feelings around with me."

The fourth question was:

4. What are some of the reasons why you might still keep going to church even though someone offended you in this way?

Responses to Question Four

The answers given were as follows:

1. a. I don't fail to go to worship God and hear his word because of someone else.
- b. I am very anxious to be closer to God...
- c. I love the Lord. (two people)
- d. To worship God.
2. To be able to be more forgiving. I feel closer to reaching this goal in God's house.
3. N A (Probably meaning "not applicable")
4. a. I go to church because I believe I'm helping support it.
- b. This is my home church ...
- c. Because I wouldn't let people keep me from going to church.
- d. Because I love my church (three people)
5. It's the real thing to do.
6. Fellowship

Analysis of Responses to Question Four

Loyalty to God and to church: Loyalty to God seems to stand out as an important reason for continuing to go to church in spite of the pain of shame. Loyalty to church seems to be almost as important as loyalty to God.

Seeking spiritual help: Response number 2, "To be able to be more forgiving," is significant. The author knows that this person has struggled to for-

give another person for many years. (She discussed her answers.) Relief only seems to come in church. This person is there every time the doors are opened.

Love and fellowship: Two responses above indicate that some shame-burdened people can receive love and fellowship from others in spite of shaming incidents and situations. However, it must be remembered that not all of the twenty-one respondents scored so high on the TOSCA shame-proneness scale. It is possible that those with lower scores gave the responses concerning love and fellowship. More detailed research might shed some light on whether highly shame-prone persons come to church because they have received love there.

The conclusion is that the highly shame-prone have trouble feeling love and fellowship because of their preoccupation with their own shame, and fear of rejection. On the other hand, it may indeed be that the love and fellowship of one or more church members is all that is keeping some shame-prone persons in church.

The fifth and final question was:

5. What is the most important reason why you might ignore slights and hurts of this kind and keep on coming to church? (It might be one of your answers to 4. just above, or it might be another reason not yet mentioned.)

Responses to Question Five

The answers are categorized for ease of reading. Most are word for word from the questionnaire. Some answers are from interviews with those two who had trouble filling out the form, and are not word for word:

1. My divorce and the terrible situation I was in before the divorce. (This person is referring to the solace that worship in church gave after the emotional trauma of a divorce.)
2. a. I enjoy church and come to worship God.
 b. I go to church to worship.

- c. Because I know God would get me strength to face it.
(In other words, God would give this person strength to face problems.)
- 3. a. I care about our pastor and family, our members and our church, especially ---- (name of an individual in that church).
b. The fellowship is important; real important.
- 4. a. Not any body can keep me from coming to Peaceful.
b. No one could hurt my feelings enough to keep me from coming to church.
- 5. Over the years there have been so many embarrassing things that have driven others away that I made up my mind to go to church no matter what.
- 6. I need to be spiritually fed by the sermon.
- 7. I don't get my feelings hurt at church because my mother taught us not to go with our feelings on our shoulder.

Conclusions About Shame-Prone High Attenders

Desire to worship God overcomes shame: From the responses given above, it seems that the simple desire to worship God — either as a duty or as a pleasure — overcame shame-based anxiety enough to attend church. Perhaps one strategy for dealing with shame-prone persons is to stress the importance to God of their presence in the communal worship event.

Love overcomes shame: The answer given in response 3, "I care about our pastor and family, our members and our church," makes one think of I John 4:18 "There is no fear in love; but perfect love casteth out fear...." This seems to indicate that very strong love for a fellow church member, perhaps one's spouse, overcomes the anxiety of shame. A second strategy in dealing with shame-prone people would therefore be to work to secure at least one very strong love bond for that person in the church.

Healthy feelings of autonomy overcome shame: The response, "Not any body can keep me from coming" is a very visceral and powerful reply. This person is saying that a healthy sense of identity is alive and strong enough to withstand the feelings of shame. A very important third strategy in dealing with shame-based persons may be simply to encourage this kind of healthy attitude of auton-

omy. One might say, "No one at church has the right to deny you a seat," or "You have just as much right to be there as anyone else in God's eyes," and so on. Parents should be encouraged to teach their children, "Don't go to church with your feelings on your shoulder."

An example of the power of a healthy sense of autonomy: The author knows of one highly shame-prone person in Peaceful UMC who tells publicly that once upon a time, some years ago, when there was a church fight going on, the pastor came to his house and told him that it would probably be best if he did not come to church any more. That highly shame-prone person will probably carry the scars of that rejecting statement to his grave.

His wife says the pastor only said something much less rejecting, something like, "Well, if you feel that way, then why come to church at all?" Yet, being shame-prone, this man remembers it as an absolute order to stay away from church! However, it is highly significant that this person, who scored one standard deviation above the population norm on the TOSCA shame-proneness scale, nevertheless had the highest attendance score for the time period when attendance records were kept! The power of a healthy autonomous response ("Not anybody can keep me from coming") cannot be underestimated. Also, it must be considered that the wife kept this particular individual from over-reacting.

Conclusion

The second questionnaire resulted in phenomenological evidence that shame-prone high attenders are motivated by:

- 1) a strong desire or feeling of duty to worship God;
- 2) the presence of one or more deep love relationships with a person or persons who attend in the congregation; and
- 3) a developing healthy sense of autonomy which fights against the natural shame-based desire to withdraw.

Chapter nine will explore ways of healing shame in light of these findings.

CHAPTER EIGHT

Toward A Theology of Shame

Introduction

This chapter has three sections. The first is a word study of shame as it appears in the Bible. The second is a brief exposition of how shame issues were dealt with by four major Christian figures: St. Augustine, St. Francis, Martin Luther, and John Wesley. The third gives some conclusions concerning the concept of shame from a theological point of view.

None of the three sections is exhaustive. Each section is just to provoke the reader to reconsider biblical, historical, and theological issues from a shame perspective.

Section I. Word Study

The Word 'Shame' Is Frequent in the Bible

Cognate words for shame: Shame is definitely a biblical concept. In the King James Version of the Bible, the word "shame" and its cognates such as "ashamed" and "shameful" appear in 221 verses. Conceptually related words and their cognates such as "blush" (3 verses), "confound" (51 verses), "despise" (37 verses), "dishonour" (14 verses), "dismay" (30 verses), "humble" (67 verses), "mock" (51 verses), "modest" (1 verse), "reject" (27 verses), "reproach" (115 verses), "scorn" (43 verses), and "vex" (15 verses) make a total of 675 verses, or the equivalent of one whole book of the Bible, 45 chapters long with 15 verses in each chapter.

Shame as a form of wounding: As was noted in chapter one, the Jewish Talmud says that humiliation is worse than physical pain, and shaming another in public is like shedding blood.¹⁷⁶

John Patton has an interesting list of the ways found in the Scriptures that a person might be shamed:

- Violation of modesty (I Cor. 11:6)
- Disappointment (Hosea 10:6)
- Disgrace from sin (Lev. 20:17)
- Disgrace from God (Psa. 44:9)
- Natural calamity such as barrenness (Gen. 30:23).¹⁷⁷

Shame as related to pride: Lyn Huber says that shame in ancient Israel is strongly related to pride.¹⁷⁸ Proverbs 11:2 says, "When pride cometh, then cometh shame...." Shame is thus seen in Proverbs as a consequence of pride. The psychological name for the pride which produces shame is grandiosity.

The Bible links pride to wickedness (Psa. 36:11), contention (Pro. 13:10), hardening of the mind (Dan. 5:20), self-deception (Oba. 1:3), and self-destruction (Pro. 16:18). The biblical reason pride is so bad is that it involves a rejection of God (Psalms 10:4, "The wicked, through the pride of his countenance, will not seek after God: God is not in all his thoughts."). The proud person will be abased, brought low, resisted, shamed, and humiliated by God (Isa. 2:12, I Pet. 5:5). This predates the modern psychological idea of the cyclical nature of shame leading to anxiety, which leads to proud behavior, which backfires and leads back to shame again.¹⁷⁹

Instead of acting with pride, when one is tempted to avoid shame producing situations, one should act with humility, so as to receive the grace of God. This breaks the cycle. I Peter 5:5 says, " ..be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble." It will be seen in the next chapter how the grace of God is one antidote to shame.

A Survey of Shame In the Old Testament

Three Old Testament Incidents

The focus of the following survey will be on just a few of many major shaming incidents found in the Old Testament, both to establish their presence in ancient thought and to show the prevalence of shame as a biblical dynamic.

1. Adam and Eve: Shame entered the world when Adam and Eve first sinned: whereas prior to their fall they were naked and unashamed (Gen. 2:25), after sinning their very first act was to seek to cover themselves (Gen. 3:7). It will be shown in the word study below (see ervah) that there is a strong biblical relationship between shame and being uncovered and naked.

Psychologist John Bradshaw shows how basic is the concept of shame to theology in his description of Adam's fall:

Toxic shame . . . becomes the core of neurosis, character disorders, political violence, wars and criminality. It comes the closest to defining human bondage of all the things I know. . . . The Bible describes shame as the core and consequence of Adam's fall. . . . The Bible suggests that Adam was not satisfied with his own being. He wanted to be more than he was. He wanted to be more than human. He failed to accept his essential limitations. He lost his healthy shame. The Bible suggests that the origin of human bondage (original sin) is the desire to be other than who we are...to be more than human. In his toxic shame (pride), Adam wanted a false self. The false self led to his destruction. After Adam alienated his true being, he went into hiding. . . . Before the fall the man and the woman were both naked and 'were not ashamed' (Genesis 2:25). Once they chose to be other than what they were, they became naked and ashamed."¹⁰⁰

2. Cain and Abel: Cain committed the first murder over a shame related incident with the Lord in which the Lord "had not respect" toward Cain's offering (Gen. 4:5). Because God rejected his offering, Cain felt rejected. This shaming incident with rejection as the cause of shame threatened the core identity of Cain. Refusing to heed the Lord's healing admonishments, Cain developed toxic shame which led directly to the murder of Abel (Gen. 4:8). Modern psy-

chologist Gershen Kaufman explains the relationship between shame and crime: "The victim, the target of revenge, is confused with the source of the perpetrator's shame. By defeating and humiliating the victim, the perpetrator is momentarily freed of shame."¹⁸¹ According to Kurt Reizler, Cain, when the Lord rejected his offering, killed Abel to prevent Abel from witnessing his shame.¹⁸²

3. Haman and Mordecai: What made Haman so angry at Mordecai was that Mordecai was disrespectful toward him (Esther 3:5). The biblical concept of shame will be shown to be closely related to contempt (see the word study of buz). Showing contempt is the opposite of giving honor. Haman wanted respect and honor. However, he received contempt instead (contempt being shaming behavior, i.e. behavior which produces toxic shame). When Mordecai refused to bow, thus dishonoring him, Haman's rage reaction was homicidal in its intensity.

Other incidents: The list of shaming incidents in the Old Testament goes on and on. Just from one book of the Bible, here are a few: a) David's wife Michal felt disgraced and despised David when he danced before the Lord, revealing his nakedness to the servant girls, resulting in the end of marital relations between David and Michal, II Sam. 6:16. b) King David's three diplomats had their beards half-shaven off and their buttocks exposed to humiliate them, resulting in war, II Sam. 10:4. c) As a final example, David's daughter Tamar was shamed by being raped by her brother Amnon, resulting in Absalom plotting and carrying out the murder of Amnon, II Sam. 13:19, 28. Shame was taken seriously in Old Testament times.

A Word Study of Shame In The Old Testament

The following word study of shame (and, below, the word study of shame in the New Testament) uses the King James Version throughout because the KJV tends

to translate words more consistently, depending less on dynamic equivalence than do other translations. Though it may suit other purposes less well, using the KJV makes it easier to compare the English translations of each Hebrew and Greek word. The anglicization of the Hebrew and Greek words is that of Young's Analytical Concordance to the Bible.¹⁸³

1. "Bosh" and blushing: The most used word for shame in the Old Testament is bosh, translated "ashamed" 71 times and "confounded" 21 times, and translated in the noun form as "shame" 20 times. Wilson says the primary meaning of bosh "seems to lie in paleness caused by fear; it is therefore used of confusion and consciousness of disgrace...."¹⁸⁴ Bosh is used in parallelismus membrorum with blushing (Ezra 9:6, Jer. 14:3); fear (Isa. 20:5); turning the back (Jer. 48:39); and being emotionally troubled (Psa. 83:17). Bosh is something that is located upon the face (Ezek. 7:18). (See also the word study of chapter below). Bosh can cover a person entirely (Mic. 7:10).

2. "Buz" and contempt: Buz is most often translated as "to despise" (10 times); in the noun form it becomes "contempt" (8 times). Buz is something that can be poured upon a person (Job 12:21, Psa. 107:40); removed from a person (Psa. 119:22); or fill a person (Psa. 123:3). A person can literally become buz, contempt (Gen. 38:23). One would buz, have contempt for, a thief but even more so an adulterer (Prov. 6:30-33); one who would buz one's own mother is worthy of death (Prov. 23:22); and one would buz anything offered in order to buy one's love (S. of Sol. 8:7). All these usages lead to understanding buz as a noun to mean contempt and as a verb to mean to despise, scorn, or reject.

Gershen Kaufman says that contempt affect is a feeling of superiority or elevation over others: "Arrogance wears the face of contempt. ... Contempt is the affect of rejection."¹⁸⁵ It is the affect, i.e. emotion, of contempt which

communicates rejection and which produces shame and shame-based behavior, according to Kaufman. This is exactly in line with Hebrew thought.

3. "Chapher" and confusion / hiding the face: Chapher is translated as "confounded" or "brought to confusion" seven times; as "ashamed" four times; and as "put to shame" or "bring to shame" four times. Chapher appears often in parallel with bosh: thus, in Psa.. 35:26 and Psa.. 40:14, "Let them be bosh and chapher" (blushing and confused).

The basic meaning of chapher is to hang down the head in order to hide the face, according to Wilson.¹⁸⁶ We see this in Psa.. 35:26 where chapher appears in parallel with "turned back," apparently in order to hide the face. Chapher also means to blush, according to the Hebrew Lexicon.¹⁸⁷ Biblical evidence is that this word does relate to the face; in Psalm 34:5, chapher describes a darkened face — could this be a downturned face? Kaufman the psychotherapist and studier of shame says, "The individual whose head hangs, or whose eyes lower, or whose gaze is averted, however briefly, is directly communicating shame."¹⁸⁸ The face of Cain fell — describing a turning downward of the head — when the Lord did not accept his sacrifice (Gen. 4:5). Kaufman says, "Because shame inevitably calls attention to the face, shame and self-consciousness are tightly bound."¹⁸⁹

By contrast, Moses, who was filled with the glory of God, had a shining face (Exo. 34:29). The blessing of Num. 6:26, that the face of the Lord shine upon the one blessed, takes on added significance if it is so that the emotion of acceptance is to be found on the face of God. The blessing would mean "the Lord be filled with acceptance and love toward you."

4. "Chesed" and scrutiny: This word appears only once translated as shame: Proverbs 25:9-10, "Debate thy cause with thy neighbour himself; and discover not

a secret to another: lest he that heareth it put thee to shame [chesed] and thine infamy turn not away." The interesting thing is that chesed is the Hebrew word for mercy! Chesed is translated in the KJV as "mercy" or "kindness" over 250 times; however, it is also translated in Prov. 14:34 as "reproach," and in Prov. 25:10 as "evil report."

How is the idea of mercy connected to shame, reproach, and evil report? The connection is in the root meaning of chesed: mercy means that one is paid kind attention, while shame or reproach means that one is paid too much attention, is shown negative attention, is given an evil report or reputation.

The Hebrew concept of shame is that it is an unbearable sense of being intensely noticed by the world and found wanting and wounded; wounded in reputation, wanting in one's very essence, wounded and wanting under the intense and embarrassing attention of one's peers. That is why chesed, in the sense of close attention, is the word which is used to mean shame in Prov. 25:10. "Infamy" is the word placed in parallel to chesed in that verse, "lest he that heareth it put thee to chesed and thine infamy turn not away," specifying that the close attention of the entire community would give one a bad reputation in the eyes of one's peers.

5. "Cherpah" and being exposed: Cherpah has as its root charaph and is a different word from the third word examined above (chapter), which meant "to blush". In the KJV, cherpah is translated as "reproach" 69 times; as "shame" three times; and as "rebuke" twice, so obviously the translators felt that "reproach" came closest to defining this word. Cherpah has as its Hebrew root meaning "to pluck," as in gathering fruit. It has the meaning of shame, it is supposed, from the idea of exposing the inside of a person — plucking out and disclosing the inner nature of a person's thoughts and emotions. To illustrate:

in Lev. 19:20, cherpah is translated as "betrothed," where the meaning is literally that a woman be plucked by a man.

What sets cherpah apart from the other shame words is its root concept of exposure, plucking out what is hidden and revealing it to others. In modern psychology, Kaufman says: "Shame reveals the inner self, exposing it to view."¹⁹ Kaufman adds, "Sudden, unexpected exposure coupled with binding inner scrutiny characterize the essential nature of the affect of shame."²⁰

6. "Ervah" and sexual nakedness: The root of ervah is arah, meaning in its verb form "to expose, uncover, make bare, make naked." In the KJV it is translated in the noun form, ervah, as "nakedness" 49 times; as "shame" once in Isa. 20:4; and as "uncleanness" once in Deu. 24:1, adding the connotation of disgust and offensive smell. Although it is only translated once as shame, the idea of shame is definitely connected in the biblical mind with nakedness, and particularly with exposure of the private sexual parts, because ervah is placed in parallel with shaming events, as shall be seen below. Furthermore, the concept of disgust toward nakedness and the offensiveness of nakedness along with embarrassment from nakedness is all in the biblical usage.

Clothing is for the purpose of covering ervah, nakedness; so Ex. 28:42, "linen breeches to cover the flesh of their nakedness (ervah)."²¹ The laws forbidding sexual congress with kin actually forbid uncovering the relative's ervah, nakedness by removing clothing. In Isa. 20:4, God says that Egyptian prisoners are to be shamed by the Assyrian king through being stripped naked:

So shall the king of Assyria lead away the Egyptians prisoners, and the Ethiopians captives, young and old, naked and barefoot, even with [their] buttocks uncovered, to the shame of Egypt.

Being ervah, naked, can cause a brave man to flee in cowardice, Amos 2:16, "And he that is courageous among the mighty shall flee away naked in that day...." so as not to be seen.

Adam and Eve were naked (ervah) and were not ashamed (bosh), Gen. 2:25. The immediate result of the fall in the garden was the emotion of shame in relationship to nakedness. By covering and thus cancelling or alleviating the ervah, the nakedness, God was showing mercy, alleviating their shame.

Clothing seems to have importance throughout the Bible as a healer of shame and a giver of status. Baptism in the New Testament is referred to as a clothing of oneself with Christ, Gal. 3:27. Those that overcome in this life shall be clothed in heaven with white raiment, Rev. 3:5, which is the righteousness of the saints, Rev. 19:8. Samson wagered for clothing as a prize; when he won, it shamed his Philistine opponents to lose clothing, and status, to Samson (Jud. 14:12).

The formation of the sexual drive is bound, in Kaufman's view, when one's sexuality is shamed. He says, "All later sexual dysfunctions have their origins in sex-shame binds, or in sex-disgust binds...."¹⁰² Nudity is one avenue, along with many others, whereby a person may be placed in a sex-shame bind. This fits exactly with the phenomenology of the Hebrew idea of ervah, nakedness, as causing shame. The next Hebrew word adds to the connection of sexual immodesty with shame:

7. "Galah" and shameless uncovering: A root word, occurring only once in the Old Testament at II Sam. 6:20, this word means "to shamelessly uncover" and will enable the discussion of the relation between shame, nakedness and dysfunctional sexuality to continue. When King David uncovered himself while dancing

before the Lord in the view of the handmaids of his servants, Michal his wife comments:

How glorious was the king of Israel to day, who uncovered himself to day in the eyes of the handmaids of his servants, as one of the vain fellows shamelessly uncovereth (galah) himself!

Michal, no doubt feeling that David had disgraced and publicly humiliated her as well as him, sarcastically tells David that his actions made him glorious: "How glorious was the king of Israel to day." This fits with the understanding of shame as the opposite of glory, as was spoken of above. Michal shames David by sarcastically calling his action the opposite of what she felt it to be.

Leviticus 18 said, "thou shalt not uncover ... nakedness." The uncovering was instrumental in breaking the boundary. The incident was so serious that it damaged their marriage. David never had sexual relations with her again, it is supposed, since she never bore another child, II Sam. 6:23. Their marriage apparently was ruined by a moment of galah.

Note that, as Kaufman puts it,¹⁹³ "contempt breeds contempt": David was in turn offended by Michal's being offended. David avoids dealing with her accusation and excuses himself by saying he was dancing before the Lord. He gets angry, a typical response to being shamed, and says he will make himself more vile and base than that, and that the maidens who saw him dancing before the Lord will hold him in honor, II Sam. 6:21-22. He tries, in effect, to shame Michal as a defense against being shamed by her.

David had sexual identity problems all his life. There followed the adultery with Bathsheba (II Sam. 11:1 ff.). Then David's children had sex problems: Amnon raped his sister Tamar (II Sam. 13:1 ff.); Absalom went in to David's harem before all Israel (II Sam. 16:22); and Solomon later had 700 wives and 300 concubines (I Kgs. 11:3). Finally, at the end of David's life, he was sexually

depleted, not even aroused by Abishag of Shunem, the most physically attractive woman in the entire kingdom (I Kings 1:3-4).

David's problems with sexuality were what Kaufman would call a sex-shame bind. It is not an exaggeration to say that the whole history of Israel as a nation was affected by unresolved shame in David's life. To fall sexually is to shame others as well as oneself, then and now, as the erstwhile followers of Jim Bakker and Jimmy Swaggart might testify.

8. "Kelimmah" and public dishonor: Although kelimmah's root, kalam, has the same root meaning, "to blush," as does the third Hebrew word for shame, chapher, it is translated "shame" much more often — nineteen times. It is translated as "confusion" six times, "dishonour" three, and "reproach" once.

As opposed to bosh, which connotes internal feelings of shame, kelimmah as it appears in scripture has to do with external aspects of shame. Kelimmah is used of shame from public and divine punishment in Ezekiel 16:52 and Jeremiah 14:3. The idea of shame as being exposure to public ridicule and contempt has already been covered in the analysis of chesed and cherpah.

9. "Qalon" and despising: The idea of this next word is to consider someone else worthy of despising, or to make light of them, as in Deu. 27:16, "Cursed is he who setteth light by his father or mother." Qalon the noun is translated as "shame" thirteen times, and once each as "dishonour" (Prov. 6:33), "confusion" (Job 10:15), "ignominy" (Prov. 18:3), and "reproach" (Prov. 22:10).

In Habakkuk 2:16, this word is set as opposite to glory: "You are filled with shame [qalon] instead of glory...shameful spewing (same word) shall be on your glory." The image in the Hebrew is of spitting.

Spitting on someone was a Hebrew expression of contempt and shaming. Two prime examples of this are found in Numbers 12:14 where God says of Miriam, "If

her father had but spit in her face...." and in Deuteronomy 25:9 where the consequence of refusing to raise up children by one's dead brother's wife was public humiliation: "Then shall his brother's wife ... spit in his face." Jesus was humiliated by being spat upon, Mat. 26:67.

One might suppose that being spat upon would cause one to scrunch up one's face in disgust, so that the act of spitting on someone was a sort of lex talionis: if one perpetrated shame on others, then shame would be caused to the perpetrator. By spitting on the person, the offended one expelled body fluid which normally would only be expelled on the earth as something unclean, making the spat-upon face unclean and thus expressing contempt, saying in effect "I make you unclean."

Simultaneously, the spat-upon face would react physiologically to being spat upon by scrunching up, just as a person's back would wince from the lash. As the rod across the backside of a child expressed lex talionis by delivering pain to the child who had caused pain to others, the spitting caused the face to "feel shame" or disgust at being spat upon. The face was made unclean, in retaliation for having caused shame in the offended one or in the community. Thus the measure one gave (disgust for others) would be the measure one received (disgust for oneself).

The fact that Jesus spat upon some earth and made a clay compress to heal a blind man's eyes is startling, considering the Old Testament view of spitting as showing disgust. Apparently there are exceptions depending upon the circumstances. Jesus did not spit on the man's face but on the ground. The word used to describe His action toward the man is "anointed the eyes," John 9:6. Apparently even in biblical times, one endured indignities as though they were not indignities when the purpose was not to insult but to heal.

10. "Shimtsah" and scandal: Only appearing once in the Old Testament, at Exo. 32:25, the idea of this word is a whispering or muttering. It has to do with a person having ill fame, being talked about in a negative way so as to cause the person to run away or be overthrown.

The situation in Exodus 32 is that Aaron is apologetically explaining to Moses how there came to be a golden calf: "And I said unto them, Whosoever hath any gold, let them break it off. So they gave it me: then I cast it into the fire, and there came out this calf" (vs. 24). Moses' response was not very accepting or understanding (vss. 25-26):

"And when Moses saw that the people were naked; (for Aaron had made them naked unto their shame" [shimtsah, ill fame, whispering] "among their enemies:) Then Moses stood in the gate of the camp, and said, Who is on the LORD'S side? let him come unto me. And all the sons of Levi gathered themselves together unto him."

The consequence of idolatry was war within the camp, but a side effect of the frenzied worship — ostensibly worship of God, Exo. 32:5 — was the lowering of the normal boundaries of sexual propriety. Just as David got carried away by worship and shamed himself by revealing his nakedness, the nakedness of the worshippers of the golden calf caused shimtsah for them among their enemies, i.e. whispering and gossip.

Shame in the Jewish Talmud and in Classical Greek Thought

According to Leon Wurmser, the Babylonian Talmud, dating back to the Babylonian exile, says that humiliation is worse than physical pain (Sotah); and shaming another in public is like shedding blood (Baba Metzin). Also, the Talmud says that Jerusalem was destroyed because its people had no shame (Shabbat).¹⁹⁴ It is clear in just these three quotations that shame was seen by the Jews with two basic connotations found in the Old Testament: shame as public disgrace and shame as modesty or conscience.

Richard Trench (1807-1866) was a Greek scholar as well as archbishop of Dublin, Ireland. Trench says classical Greek thought in the centuries before Christ also gravitated toward the same two connotations for shame: public disgrace on the one hand (aischune) and modesty (aidos) on the other.¹⁹⁵ Trench says that Homer, the blind poet, used the Greek word aidos in both senses. Aidos later became connotative only of shame as modesty, while aischune came to connote shame as fear of disgrace. Homer did not know the Greek word aischune. Thucydides used both words, but used them "as equipollent and convertible."¹⁹⁶

However, beginning in the Attic period, "aidos is the shame, or sense of honor, which hinders one from doing an unworthy act; aischune is the disgrace, outward or inward, which follows on having done it (Luke xiv. 9)."¹⁹⁷ Plato made the distinction (Definitions, 416). So did Aristotle (Rhetoric, ii.6). Also, for an example of the distinctive use of aischune to mean public disgrace, Xenophon says, Anab. iii.I.10, that while he and others "were disinclined to go forward with Cyrus to assail his brother's throne, they yet were now ashamed" (aischune) "to draw back."¹⁹⁸ Aidos and aischune carry these same connotations into their use in the New Testament.

In the word study of the New Testament, below, the two terms aidos (modesty) and aischune (disgrace) as well as other Greek terms are used for distinct aspects of shame. Before the New Testament word study below, an overview of some outstanding incidents of shame in the New Testament is in order.

A Survey of Shame in the New Testament

Three New Testament Incidents

1: Herod the tetrarch and the daughter of Herodias: Herodias had been shamed by John the Baptist, who accused her of living in sin with Herod; seeking revenge, she first got Herod to jail John and then to behead him. The reason

for Herod's compliance to the request to behead John was that Herod would have been ashamed to go back on his word in front of his guests (Mat. 14:9, Mark 14:9). Guilt from murdering John was easier for Herod and Herodias to face than the feeling of public disgrace or shame.

2: Jesus shames the Pharisees: Mark 3:2-6 gives the account of Jesus defying the Pharisees in a synagogue by healing a man's withered hand on the sabbath. The committee of Pharisees was there to examine Jesus' theology and also to accuse him if they found fault with him; by doing the miracle in the synagogue on the sabbath, directly in front of the Pharisee committee, Jesus defied their contrived and unscriptural rule against healing on the sabbath while at the same time demonstrating by the miracle His contact with God in the eyes of the people, making it impossible for the Pharisees to say his action was not of God without being laughed at by the population. The public embarrassment to the Pharisees resulted in their immediately beginning to plot Jesus' death (Mark 3:6).

3: The Jews shame Jesus: The death of Jesus on the cross was itself a shaming incident. It meant total official rejection by the nation of Israel, symbolized by execution on a tree outside the gate of the city. The Sanhedrin convicted Jesus of blasphemy, indicating excommunication from relationship with God. The Sanhedrin arranged for Jesus' death, the ultimate rejection. Jesus was shamed further on the cross by His nakedness. The Pharisees faced Jesus hanging from the cross and mocked him with all their might (Mat. 27:41-43).

Other incidents: Many other incidents of shaming exist in the New Testament: a) Joseph was humiliated by Mary, but was not willing to have Mary stoned for the apparently shameful fact of her pregnancy out of wedlock; nevertheless, he was planning on the drastic step of divorcing her (Mat. 1:19). b) Herod felt

that the wise men mocked him by not returning to him, and his reaction was to murder the children under two years of age in Bethlehem (Mat. 2:16). c) Finally, in Jesus' parable of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-32) the elder son was angry at his father because the father seemed to favor the prodigal son by giving him part of the elder son's rightful double portion of the inheritance (Deu. 21:17). This was humiliating to the elder son. The celebration upon the prodigal's return was the last straw. The hitherto respectful elder son railed at his father in great anger (Luk. 15:32).

A Word Study of Shame in the New Testament

1. "Aischron" and public immodesty: Aischron is the antonym to aidos, already mentioned, and is similar enough in spelling, but not in meaning, to be confused visually with the previously discussed aischune.

According to Vine, aischron refers to "all that is contrary to purity," hence is almost exactly opposite in meaning to aidos, modesty.¹⁹⁹ Vine notes that this word seems to refer more to public than private disgrace.²⁰⁰ Looking at each instance of its occurrence in the New Testament, it seems to refer most specifically to three aspects of an animal-like baseness: first, in relation to money, it appears as greed (I Tim. 3:3, 8; Tit. 1:7, 11; I Pet. 5:2); second, in relation to sexual relationships, it appears as bestial lust (I Cor. 11:6, 14:35; Eph. 5:4, 12); and thirdly, with reference to speech, aischron seems to refer to uncontrolled vulgarity of language (Col. 3:8). Aischron thus means the immoral or amoral bestial attitude of one who has lost all sense of modesty and decency. In Phil. 3:19, Paul says that the sinful find their glory in that which in fact is a shame to them.²⁰¹

Alcoholism is one type of shame-based behavior which illustrates what modern psychology refers to as the loss of boundaries. Eventually, there is total loss of moral integrity from continued alcoholism.²²²

2. "Aischune" and public disgrace: Aischune was defined in the previous section on classical Greek usage as equivalent to fear of public disgrace. Where aischron has more of a connotation of gross immorality, aischune might be defined in New Testament usage as "public social disgrace" or humiliation. Aischune and its cognates appear a total of 35 times in the New Testament, and 29 of those times "ashamed" is the translation; three times kataischuno is translated as "be confounded," and twice as "dishonoured," while aischune is translated once as "dishonesty".

That aischune means more "disgrace" than "modesty" can be seen clearly in the New Testament usage. For example, the unjust steward of Luke 16:3 is aischunomai, ashamed, to beg; that is, he would consider himself disgraced — not immodest. Paul in II Cor. 10:8 says boasting would be an aischune, i.e. a disgrace; the thought clearly has nothing to do with a moral repugnance at boasting but rather the disgrace that would follow if one were considered a braggart. The person publicly asked to give up a higher for a lower seat, Luke 14:9, is experiencing aischune, which clearly refers to disgrace and not immodesty. The New Testament makes the fine distinction between modesty and disgrace, using aidos for modesty and moral sensitivity on the one hand (I Tim. 2:9, Heb. 12:28), and using aischune to refer to pure disgrace (and aischron, as has been seen, for bestial moral insensitivity) on the other hand.

Kin in meaning to aischune is another Greek word, paradigmatidzo, which only appears twice in the New Testament and is not treated separately here. Paradigmatidzo is translated "make a public example" in Matthew 1:19, where

Joseph was not willing to make a public example of Mary; and in Hebrews 6:6, the author states that it is impossible to renew a person to repentance when they crucify Jesus to themselves afresh and thus Jesus would be put to an open shame (paradigmatidzo). Like aischune, the Greek noun for social disgrace, the idea of the Greek verb paradigmatidzo means to cause public social disgrace for a person. In the case of Joseph and Mary, Mary would be stoned at the gate for harlotry and would thus be publicly disgraced, i.e. made a negative example. In the case of Hebrews 6:6, once again the crucifixion is presented as a means of public disgrace and public negative example. The author of Hebrews apparently considers that if a Christian recrucified Jesus by falling away from the faith, such would be impossible to forgive since it would be an attempt to publicly shame Jesus. This shows how serious it is to try to bring shame on the name of Christ. It can cost one's salvation. Shame is utterly serious business in heaven as well as upon earth, it seems.

Aischune's opposites, those things that are opposed to, defeat or dispel social shame, are: *glory* (Phil. 3:19), *exaltation* (Phil. 1:20), *hope* (Rom. 5:5), and *confidence* (I John 2:28). According to II Tim. 1:8, God overcomes aischune (fear of public disgrace), and its accompanying timidity, with *power and love and a sound mind* (i.e. discipline). Jesus, is not epaischunetai, ashamed, to call believers brethren, Hebrews 2:11, "For both he that sanctifieth and they who are sanctified are all of one: for which cause he is not ashamed to call them brethren...." So the *unity of believers* with Christ is another deliverer from shame. Paul declares that it was by the *grace of God* that one so contemptible as he became a successful apostle, II Cor. 15:10. Finally, Paul teaches Timothy in II Tim. 2:15 that by *studying to show himself approved unto God* he would become a workman that need not be anepaischuntos, disgraced.

3. "Askemosune" and sexual shame: St. Paul and St. John use this word to refer to the genitals: in I Cor. 12:23, Paul speaks of "our uncomely parts," while in Rev. 16:15, John says "Blessed is he that ... keeps his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame." (Underlined words translate the Greek askemosune.) Here again is seen the New Testament recognition of a connection between the covering or removal from sight of human sexual parts and the covering of shame.

According to Kaufman, as already touched upon in the section on the Hebrew word ervah, being shamed for the exposure of one's genitals is one avenue by which the sexual drive is shame-bound.²⁰³ The New Testament references, not to mention the Old Testament references in Genesis 3, seem to indicate that clothing (covering) is the appropriate way to alleviate the shame caused by the shaming exposure of one's genitals. Thus it might be concluded that the clothing which the saints in heaven are to receive, namely clean white linen, representing righteousness (Rev. 19:8), covers shame. (Perhaps it even heals shame.)

The removal of Jesus' clothing before the crucifixion, exposing him to public shame, can be seen as a part of the sentence against a person seen as a blasphemer of God: utter rejection and ridicule was added force by stripping Jesus naked (sexually shaming Him) in public view. There is no basis for the supposition that Jesus was left in a loincloth.

4. "Atimia" and contempt: This fourth Greek word touches on another important source of shame covered in the word study of the Old Testament, namely contempt. When one is not honored or respected but despised, the New Testament calls atimia into play to describe the resultant shame feeling. Appearing with all its cognates a total of seventeen times, atimia has the sense of disrespectful, unloving treatment in Rom. 1:24 ("dishonour their bodies"). It means con-

temptuous rejection in Jas. 2:6 ("despised the poor"). In general, atimia is the opposite of respect or honor. Its parallel word in the Hebrew is galon, to shame by making light of someone.

The servants of the owner in Jesus' parable were "entreated shamefully" (with atimia), Luk. 20:11. That is, they were beaten and thrown outside the gate to show the contempt of the wicked husbandmen for the rightful owner. When the apostles were beaten for having preached the gospel in the temple, they rejoiced that they were worthy to have suffered atimia, i.e. a contemptuous and brutal public beating intended to dishonor them, for the sake of Jesus.

The opposite of atimia is found in the Greek verb timao, to weigh, appraise, or value. In the New Testament, timao refers to preferring another person, Rom. 12:10; showing loving regard, I Pet. 3:7; and giving financial support, I Thess. 4:4. An important theological point here, gained from this word study, is that honoring cancels shame. To honor, value, and show respect and loving regard is the opposite of what it is to shame or show contempt for a person. An example would be the way in which Jesus treated Zaccheus (Luke 19:1-10). By eating with him, Jesus was honoring Zaccheus, and dealing with the shame Zaccheus felt as a tax-collector, a traitor to his people. Honor from Jesus opened the possibility of repentance and spiritual healing to Zaccheus, the shame-bound, who now found acceptance from one whose respect he craved.

5. "Entrepo" and healthy shame: The Greek word entrepo now enables a furthering of the discussion of what Trench calls "healthy shame;" entrepo, appearing only twice in the New Testament and translated as "shame" both times, specifically refers to "healthy shame," says Trench (1880), meaning modesty, which leads to a change toward correct conduct.²⁰⁴

In I Cor. 6:5 and I Cor. 15:34, Paul twice uses the phrase, "I speak to your shame (entrepo).\" Obviously Paul is appealing to the consciences, the moral capacity, the healthy shame, of his audience.

Paul, in the passages of scripture in which the word entrepo is used, is not expressing contempt or disgust toward his readers when he says "I speak to your shame.\" Instead, he is appealing to their sense of healthy shame in Trench's sense of their modesty, their consciences; and perhaps it could be added, their sense of healthy identity in Christ. He is saying, "You need to fix this so you can think well of yourselves again.\" Thus the modern psychological view of healthy shame can be seen embryonically in Paul's thought.

A Brief Survey of Shame In Christian Thought

Following the time of Christ and the apostles, it seems that Christian thought focused less on the shame (damaged perception of self, low self-esteem) of the victim of sin, and more on the guilt of the perpetrator of sin. Even though Jesus clearly dealt with the toxic shame of Zaccheus in the sycamine tree, the woman who wept and wiped his feet with her tears, the woman at the well, the Gadarene demoniac, and St. Peter after Peter betrayed Christ and fled in shame, from the apostles forward the primary interest seems to be preaching against sinfulness and for repentance rather than for the healing of souls.

Vastly simplifying, it appears as though the view over the centuries has been that salvation is more to keep one from sinning than to heal one from past victimization by sinners; i.e., salvation is more to deal with one's guilt than with one's shame-hurt identity or dysfunctional self-concept. Although one might expect early Christian writers to deal with the healing of unhealthy shame and the establishment of a whole identity as part of the process of sanctification, and as part of the responsibility of shepherds of Christian flocks, no

evidence has been found by this writer to support that expectation. This is all the more surprising owing to the substantial amount of dealing with shame found in the Old and New Testaments.

Historically, after New Testament times, sanctification was viewed more as dealing with Christian temptation to further sin, or with getting closer to God through sinlessness and sainthood, rather than as a product of inner emotional wholeness. The meaning of salvation moved away from the New Testament meaning, which included healing and wholeness, toward justification only. Only in the past century or so has inner emotional healing become a widely discussed Christian issue, it seems.²⁰⁵

With the exception of a few shepherdly minded saints such as Gregory of Nazianzus, who wrote on the "cure of souls,"²⁰⁶ the centuries have seen Christian saints focusing their thoughts primarily on preaching to the perpetrators of sin who need the grace of God to repent, rather than teaching the care of victims of sin who need the grace of God in order to be healed in spirit. However, in spite of this tendency in their written record to focus just on guilt, there is ample evidence that the saints of the past grappled in their lives with the reality of unhealthy shame, and rather successfully. Though without apparent consciousness of shame as a prime focus, each of the following major figures definitely dealt successfully with shame issues. The selection through history of only four examples will have to suffice to illustrate this point.

1. St. Augustine (354-430): Augustine does not use the term "shame" in the modern psychological sense referring to his low self-esteem, dysfunctional self-concept, or alienated self-identity. He uses the word "shame" only to talk about the embarrassment and disgrace of having formerly had a seared conscience and having had no fear of public disgrace when he was a pagan. For example, in

his Confessions, Augustine says his mother's warnings against fornication and adultery "seemed to me merely the sort of things which one might expect from a woman and which it would be a shame for me to follow... I went headlong on my way, so blind that among people of my own age I was ashamed to be more modest than they were."²⁰⁷ Confessing to God his theft of some pears, Augustine says,

The evil was foul, and I loved it; I loved destroying myself; I loved my sin — ... How base a soul, falling back from your firmament to sheer destruction, not seeking some object by shameful means but seeking shame for itself!²⁰⁸ ... It has only to be said, 'Come on, let's do it,' and we become ashamed at not being shameless.²⁰⁹

Augustine is expressing healthy shame for his former sins. Social pressure turned normal shame for sin around backwards. Augustine knows that sin kept him from healthy shame for his youthful sins. He is not saying that toxic shame is the origin of his sin, but rather is confessing his youthful lack of healthy shame to God. His shame is only in relation to his guilt.

Yet this very method, confessing shameful incidents to a counselor, is considered a good method of psychotherapy today! The original method of Augustine thus cannot be said to be completely devoid of the modern sense of the need to be free from shame. No matter that he chooses God rather than another human as his counselor; the principle is the same. Augustine said, "All our striving in this life consists in healing the eye of the heart in order that it may see God."²¹⁰ This thought is very close to the goal of modern psychotherapy in healing shame, namely to restore a healthy self-identity, or healthy self-love.

Augustine wrote much about God's grace. However, Augustine seems to view grace more as power to heal sin, rather than power to heal shame. Augustine said, "To Your" (God's) "grace I owe it, and to your mercy, that You have melted away my sins like ice."²¹¹ Yet, in spite of this focus of Augustine's on grace as related primarily to melting away sin rather than shame, it may still be

said, since shame and sin are related, that Augustine laid part of the ground-work for identifying shame as one of the things healed when sin is dealt with by God's grace.

2. St. Francis of Assisi (c.1181-1226): St. Francis is another example of a great Christian figure in history who dealt with shame in the modern psychological sense (i.e., low self-esteem), in practice but not in theory or theology especially. Francis simultaneously cultivated two things in himself and his monks: reverence toward God and all God's creation, and humility within. Both of these relate to the healing of low self-esteem as psychologists refer to it today.

Francis did not concentrate on theory but rather on rules for living. For example, he instructs his monks on humility as follows: "Blessed is the servant ... who humbly bears shame and reproof for sin when he is without fault."²¹² Francis forbade his monks to ride a horse or any animal (First Rule of Friars Minor, #15), nor could they receive alms (Second Rule of Friars Minor, #4).²¹³ He adds, "...and let them not pay attention to the least sins of others, but rather let them recount their own in the bitterness of their soul."²¹⁴ In all these rules, one might mistakenly conclude that the goal of St. Francis was to cause his monks to think little of themselves, thus lowering their self-esteem; however, the opposite was the case. The whole point was that when one receives the love of God, one ceases to have the need for self-aggrandizement and will be enabled to become, like Jesus, simultaneously humble and high in self-esteem, and totally dedicated to the love of others. The famous incident in which Francis kissed a filthy leper is an example of love bursting into an act of apparent self-degradation but which is in fact an act like Jesus' own acts, based on the tremendously high valuation of oneself found in experiencing God's love fully.

Francis shows a profound healing within himself of any internal shame in his own intense desire to show reverence for others. It was said of Francis that "He listens to those to whom God himself will not listen."²¹⁵ Even before his conversion was complete, giving respect to the outcast was his nature. Once, when his military unit had captured a traitor, Francis "simply treated him exactly like all the rest, neither with coldness nor compassion, but with the same unaffected gaiety and good fellowship."²¹⁶ He commanded, "And wherever the brothers are ... let them spiritually and diligently show reverence and honor toward one another without murmuring."²¹⁷

It has already been established in this chapter that giving honor is the opposite of shaming others. The centrality of reverence, giving honor, and unself-conscious humility in the life and rule of Francis shows that as a practical matter if not a theoretical one, the healing of internal shame was a major element of his sainthood.

3. Martin Luther (1483-1546): Martin Luther is still another example of a great figure in Christian history who dealt with the healing of shame (low self-esteem) on a personal level, but not on a theoretical or consciously theological level, in his spiritual journey.

Erik H. Erikson, modern psychologist, has done a study of Luther's inner spiritual life from the modern psychological standpoint. After one year in an Augustinian monastery, Luther was admitted to the profession of full-fledged monk in a ritual that involved the changing of clothes — which has been established earlier as a biblical motif in the increase of self-esteem. Erikson reports on his historical research into this important moment in Luther's life as follows: "Now the prior undresses the novice. 'The Lord divest you of the former man and of all his works'; and 'The Lord invest you with the new man.'"²¹⁸

This ceremony had a great deal to do with Luther's self-concept as one made perfect by the outer work of being made a priest.

However, Luther's self-concept could not be reconciled with the perfectionistic theology of salvation by works of his age, in which priests were seen as required to be sinless during the mass, based on a complete confession and absolution of their sins. Luther became terrified of committing a sin inadvertently during his officiation at his first mass, because it would not be possible to get absolution in the confessional while doing the mass. Erikson tells of Luther's terrible anxiety attack during his first mass. Luther fled the mass, to his earthly father's supreme disgust, contempt, and anger (all shaming behaviors), which Luther's father expressed loudly in the banquet following the mass. Luther said that as he read the words appealing to "the most merciful Father," he "suddenly felt that I was about to speak to God directly, without any mediator."²¹⁹ Luther says "he 'almost died' from anxiety because he felt no faith (weil kein Glaube da war)." He "had not yet learned to speak with God 'without embarrassment.'"²²⁰

Erikson says that both Luther and Freud "endeavored to increase the margin of man's inner freedom by introspective means applied to the very center of his conflicts...."²²¹ Luther's doctrine of justification by faith should be seen as a declaration that God's grace was for healing the inner person of shame, i.e. restoring self-esteem, through removing guilt for love's sake rather than merit's sake. Justification by faith rather than by works could be restated in modern psychological language as recognizing that God's grace is not gained by perfectionistic, shame-bound attempts to gain God's approval through deeds, but rather God's grace is gained through simply receiving God's undeserved forgiveness of sins, which forgiveness proves God's love, approval, and esteem. Thus

Luther dealt with shame drastically in his doctrine, yet only indirectly, i.e. with guilt from sin uppermost in his writing rather than questions of identity or shame from rejection. Guilt was still the primary focus of theology.

4. John Wesley (1703-1791): Wesley is still another great Christian figure who dealt mightily — and with great practical results — in shame issues. Yet Wesley did not focus upon the modern psychological meaning of shame (dysfunctional self-concept) as an issue to be dealt with specifically or separately. The relation of Wesley's practical theology to shame and a healthy self-concept must be picked out of his writings, from his actions, and from the rules of his Methodist societies.

It is to be noted, in the progression from earlier to more modern times, from Augustine of Hippo to Francis of Assisi and on through Luther to Wesley, that there is a definite development in thought and action concerning shame issues. Wesley's writing builds upon his predecessors in this regard.

Wesley's theology of the new birth deals with the issue of a new identity in Christ. Although shame is not mentioned directly in the passage quoted below, the theology of Wesley has a great deal to do with the healing of a dysfunctional self-concept in the believer. Wesley makes the new birth equivalent to a new self-identity in modern psychological terms. Wesley distinguished between justification, even justification by faith, and the new birth. He says,

Justification implies only a relative, the new birth a real, change. God in justifying us does something *for* us; in begetting us again, He does the work *in* us. The former changes our outward relation to God, so that of enemies we become children; by the latter our immortal souls are changed, so that of sinners we become saints. The one restores us to the favour, the other to the image, of God. The one is the taking away the guilt, the other the taking away the power, of sin....²²²

It is highly noteworthy that Wesley says in this passage that God "does the work in us" and by this "our immortal souls are changed" to the very "image of God."

This language clearly refers to a change in self-concept and self-identity, producing inevitably a change in self-esteem and thus alleviating and healing shame. Justification (dealing with guilt) was seen as a separate thing.

Contempt and condemnation have been shown already to be shame-producing. In his commentary on Romans 8:1, "There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit," what Wesley says becomes highly significant regarding the healing of shame in the new believer. He says that even though "the corruption of nature does still remain ... in those who are now the children of God ...," so that there is in them "sin of every kind,"

There is no condemnation to them from God; for He hath justified them.... And there is no condemnation to them from within; for they have received, not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit which is of God.²²³ (Emphasis added.)

Wesley makes it clear that, in spite of all failure, the new believer need fear no condemnation (in modern terms, need fear no shaming) from God, and in fact could expect to be "preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ!"²²⁴ The justification, in other words, comes in spite of sin, because of the new birth (new healed inner identity) in Christ.

This view of the new birth was most efficacious in replacing the Anglican shame-based, perfectionistic view of the need for good works, works which the poor could never hope to aspire to, in order for one to be acceptable to God. Perhaps the reason for the wildfire spread of Methodism was that it redefined grace to mean receiving a new identity (new birth) because of God's unmerited love, without works, as opposed to the old singular concept of grace as removal of guilt through merit, as the Catholics had made it in true Pharisaic spirit.

In a way similar to the views of St. Francis on humility, Wesley taught that the believer who is filled with the Spirit could expect to be "clothed with

humility." (This is also reminiscent of Luther's change from novice to monk through the ritual of changing clothing.) The believer would feel the power of God's love all over (which the modern psychologist would say came from restored self-esteem), like new clothing, and would thus be enabled to "walk with all meekness".²²⁵ The element of clothing is evidence that a new self-concept for the sinner was primarily in Wesley's thinking, rather than getting the sinner's sinful actions forgiven. First came the "heart strangely warmed," then new action.

The Methodist class meeting shows another way in which early Methodism dealt decisively with shame. The class meeting was, in modern psychological terms, a small group meeting. It could be claimed that the Methodist societies were in some sense ancestors to the modern small group movement, perhaps best exemplified by the Alcoholics Anonymous small group meeting. The rules are similar. In an A.A. meeting, the only condition is that one admit to being an alcoholic; in the Rules of the United Societies, "There is only one condition previously required in those who desire admission to these societies — 'a desire to flee from the wrath to come, to be saved from their sins.'"²²⁶

Both AA meetings today, and meetings of the Wesleyan societies then, maintain and maintained the principle of confidentiality. Rule sixteen of the Methodist society in Fetter Lane, London, stated: "That nothing which is mentioned in this Conference be by any Means mentioned out of it."²²⁷

Confession is also essential in both A.A. meetings and the old Methodist society meetings; in Fetter Lane, "...they will meet together once in a Week to confess their Faults one to another, and to pray for one another that they may be healed."²²⁸ The principle of anonymity came later, with the A.A.

There is no doubt of the strong similarity between the Methodist societies of Wesley and the modern meetings of the Alcoholics Anonymous. This is highly

significant since alcoholics are among the most shame-based of all groups in modern society, and the small group meeting is one of the most powerful tools of Alcoholics Anonymous in alleviating and healing alcoholism (which itself is a shame-based behavior according to Kaufman and Tomkins).²²⁹

This writer's favorite story of Wesley is found in his Journal somewhere. It seems that Wesley was perched in his robe upon a chair out in a field, preaching to a mob of persons, when some rowdy boys got a big bull aimed and galloping toward him somehow, as a prank. Wesley saw the bull charging. he lowered his head, and prayed. The bull suddenly stopped in his tracks and tore after the boys, much to the pleasure and awe of the crowd. Wesley by his actions was not going to be shamed by those boys. He was rock solid in his own identity and could not be threatened by charging bull, nor rotten tomato, nor hurled rock, nor in fact by any taunt whatever. Could Wesley's following have sensed in his absence of fear of being shamed the working of the Holy Spirit? If this was what attracted the crowds, then modern pastors would do well to imitate him if they can. Perhaps when one is very close to the Holy Spirit, and one's soul is healed completely, one becomes very hard, or resistant, to shame by any ordinary means.

Conclusion: Toward a Theology of Shame

The biblical basis for a theology of shame has been demonstrated here. There is a large amount of biblical material which deals with shame.

Shame is a biblical concept: Biblical word usage conforms to the modern psychology of shame on the level of several concepts: 1) the face is a primary site for expression of the emotion of shame; 2) contempt and reproach are methods of inducing shame in those who are seen as having behaved shamefully; 3) shame is connected with identity at the most basic level, so that to avoid shame

one might even commit murder, as in the case of Cain and Abel and the Pharisees and Jesus; 4) shame has three main connotations — shame as modesty, sexual modesty or moral sensitivity; shame as fear of disgrace; and shame as low self-esteem, as a sense of oneself as unworthy or bad.

Christ dealt with shame: Christ dealt with shame on the cross as well as with guilt. The new birth means a new identity in Christ which comes first, through faith; then repentance follows, as in the case of Zaccheus. The thief on the cross could do no acts of repentance, but faith and a new identity in Christ was enough to save his soul.

Jesus dealt with shame finally at Golgotha, enduring the cross and despising the shame for the joy that was set before Him, Heb. 12:2. By His innocence and obedient self-sacrifice He turned into glory the shame of being executed outside the city gate as a criminal and as a banned blasphemer. I Pet. 1:21 says of Jesus that "God ... raised him up from the dead, and gave him glory...." The New Testament concept of glory is the opposite of, the antidote to, and the healing of shame. Paul says, Gal. 6:14, "God forbid that I should glory, save in the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ...."

Much of what was done to Jesus — the replacement of Jesus' clothing with mock king's clothes, the spitting, and giving of blows by the soldiers; the cursing by one of the thieves; and the reviling and mockery of the crowds and of the Sanhedrin — has to do directly with shaming actions. Our salvation can be seen to be a rescue from humanity's descent into shame from the fall in the garden of Eden. God makes the believer glory-filled once again by removing shame through identification with Christ on the cross and in the resurrection.

Shame was misplaced in Christian thought: Finally, moving through the history of Christian thought since the time of Christ and the Apostles to the

present, it seems as if Christian theology moved away from perceiving grace as being toward shame and moved toward a view of grace as only for guilt. Augustine spoke of shame regarding guilt for sins, but no system of rules or actions is recorded for dealing with that shame except Augustine's confession to God as his heavenly psychotherapist. St. Francis had no specific theology of the healing of shame, yet many of his rules related to the healing of shame through an acceptance of the love of God and the showing of unconditional positive regard toward all of God's creation. Luther dealt decisively with shame as low self-esteem, though not focusing on it conceptually, in the area of theology, by laying the groundwork for a more correct understanding of God's grace as not conditional upon works but upon faith. Wesley preached a gospel which connected the individual to the love of God through the new birth in such a way as to establish a new identity in Christ, healing shame. He also established societies with rules which were designed to have a therapeutic effect upon the shame-based problems of its members. Going on to perfection meant a new identity in Christ, motivating one to live Christlike, and not just meritorious living to escape the wrath of God.

A Theology of Shame Is Needed Today

In modern theology, grace is still seen to be connected more to the cross's removal of guilt than to the emotional healing of shame. There are, however, a few exceptions.

Lowell Noble: In 1975, Christian anthropologist Lowell L. Noble wrote a work for missionaries entitled Naked and Not Ashamed, to prepare them for evangelizing shame-based cultures in other parts of the world.²³¹ It is the first book in this writer's knowledge that gives a groundwork for a theology of shame. In that work Noble states that preaching against guilt alone does not give a

sinner an adequate basis for morality. One must preach the new identity which delivers from the shame nature.

Noble's work, which includes an extensive section elucidating scriptural passages taking shame into account, is a first step toward a theology of shame. Covering eleven shame cultures around the world, Noble shows how a gospel which preached to shame concerns would better reach the unsaved. He concludes with suggestions for sermons which liberate from shame, and finally a suggestion for using the small group as an evangelistic tool to help people deal with personal shame issues.

Carl D. Schneider: A work which deeply and richly considers shame and the sacred is Carl D. Schneider's book, Shame, Exposure, and Privacy.²³¹ Illustrating from anthropological examples, Nietzsche, Sartre, and Freud, Schneider raises disturbing issues, which are profoundly theological in nature, concerning shame and the sacred. Any theology of shame must grapple, as Nietzsche did, with how the closeness of God within affects one's self-identity and autonomy.

David Seamands: Dr. David Seamands, in his book, Healing Grace, has coined a term, "dysgrace," for the damaged self-esteem, or shame, which results from the absence of parental grace — acceptance, affection, and affirmation.²³² Seamands' focus is on healing what he terms "global guilt" by dealing with underlying shame. Seamands, unlike most modern theologians, is aware that the shame-guilt cycle begins with shame, not guilt.²³³ Without ever using the word "shame," Seamands deals with it. Referring to concepts such as the "performance trap" and the "tyranny of the oughts," Seamands says that a correct understanding of God's grace alleviates the elder brother syndrome of Pharisaism.

Leaving theology now, the next chapter will focus on practical matters of pastoral concern.

CHAPTER NINE

Ways to Heal Shame

Introduction

This dissertation is primarily oriented toward practice rather than theory. Chapter nine will therefore integrate the preceding chapters around the theme of pastoral care of the shame-prone. This chapter is based upon the statistical study, theory, and theology of the entire work, which come together in this chapter to inform the pastor for personal, familial, counseling, and church administrative tasks as they are affected by the presence of shame-proneness.

Chapter nine will have three sections: 1) the pastor and personal shame issues, 2) pastors and the shame-prone, and 3) pastors administering a church with shame-prone members.

I. The Pastor and Personal Shame Issues

Discover and Deal With the Self's Own Shame Issues

Working with the shame-prone is hard, because the pastor just does not enjoy dealing with people who are going to be unfairly critical, who will not level, who assume the pastor is against them, doesn't love them, and so on. But the pastor must comprehend the real reason for not wanting to go visit the shame-prone: the pastor's own shame issues. Once the pastor's own shame issues are well and truly dealt with, the pastor will discover that it is easier to visit the shame-prone. Kurtz, who works with alcoholics, says, "...only one who has experienced shame is capable of touching and healing shame."²³⁴ Kaufman adds,

In order to effectively tolerate and master shame, clients require therapists who already are able to do so. ...shame activates shame. A client's shame can and will spontaneously activate shame in a therapist. Therapists who avoid or otherwise defend against their own shame, however activated, unfortunately recreate their client's familial patterns.²³⁵

Give Framework Security to the Pastoral Family

In order to be most effective with the shame-prone, everything about the pastor must bespeak safety and confidentiality. Pastors who do not protect their own families' privacy will find that the shame-prone will not trust them.

If a pastor uses an incident from the home, involving spouse or children, in a sermon illustration, the pastor does two things wrong: first, the family member is alienated and feels embarrassed; and second, every church member is served notice that the pastor blabs and no personal relationship is sacred.

In a book called Rating Your Psychotherapist, Robert Langs, M.D., says that no matter what the conscious feelings of the client, when a psychotherapist does not make secure what Langs calls the "framework" (i.e., the unconscious structure of therapy) secure, then the deep unconscious of the client will reject therapy. For purposes here, the items of framework relevant are total privacy and total confidentiality.²³⁶ The pastor says, when not protecting the privacy and confidentiality of family members, that neither will the pastor protect the privacy and confidentiality of the shame-prone, who then may not respond to pastoral care except superficially and manipulatively.

II. Pastors and the Shame-Prone

Give Framework Security to the Shame-Prone

Although the pastor is not (usually) a psychotherapist also, there are enough similarities to warrant comparing the pastor's responsibilities with those of the psychotherapist. Kaufman says,

Psychotherapy must provide a reparative, security-giving relationship, one that heals shame through new experiences of identification. Above all, psychotherapy is a relationship, not a technique or stratagem. ... Just as children require a security-giving relationship for optimal growth, so do clients.²³⁷

Ed Ramsey, a therapist working with alcoholics, says about Alcoholics Anonymous, "The AA community offers a safe and caring environment for a person to risk exposure of his shame in order to resolve it. The traditions of AA reinforce this safety through anonymity."²³⁸ The pastor should consider the following points to provide the shame-prone member framework security (based on Langs):

- 1) the pastor should not inhibit the shame-prone person from saying anything that comes to mind; this means taking care not to interrupt, not to make moral pronouncements, not to say anything at all that responds to the anger of the person.

- 2) The pastor should ideally speak (make a therapeutic intervention) only when absolutely certain that no personal shame issues are coming out. This means no giving of advice, and above all it means the pastor should not let the pastor's own material intrude. Therapeutically speaking, when the pastor says "Something like this happened to me; I know how you feel," the shame-prone person is more likely to react negatively than positively. This is known in missionary circles as the "ego-centered turnoff," in which one intrudes one's own experience. The pastor should strive to remain anonymous in the therapeutic sense of not sharing personal stories, because sharing personal stories says to the shame-prone person, "This pastor isn't listening to me."

- 3) Total privacy and total confidentiality have already been mentioned. There is not really a need to keep pastoral visits secret, but there is definitely a need to give the shame-prone person a certainty that the pastor is not sharing anything said confidentially.

What the pastor should do, instead of giving advice or reacting to the shame-prone person's anger, is to say with words and deeds, "I believe in you and highly esteem you; I know you are hurting; and I want to be with you as you work toward a better self-identity."

Restore the Interpersonal Bridge

Kaufman uses the term "restoring the interpersonal bridge" to refer to the repair of developmental deficits. It means that, to a degree, the therapist enters into a re-parenting relationship with the shame-prone client, replacing

bad ways of relating and bad beliefs about the self with healthy ones. This will mean that the pastor should:

Recognize symptoms of shame-proneness: Some symptoms of shame-proneness are: low self-esteem; blowing small embarrassments out of proportion; injustice collecting; presuming ulterior motives; paranoia; narapoa (see chapter three, page 54); withdrawal; secretiveness; excessive apology or excessive anger; and making people feel anxious or on pins and needles around them.

Expect denial, depression, and prejudice: Expect denial. A shame-prone person can receive forty visits from concerned church friends, but until the "guilty party" comes, the shame-prone person may say to the pastor, "No one has been to see me; nobody cares." The pastor must work hard to get all the facts, not for confrontational purposes but in order not to be manipulated or misled.²³⁹

Expect depression. A shame-prone person is living as though perpetually grieving a state of loss. Apply the stages of grief from the book, On Death and Dying, by Elizabeth Kubler-Ross: denial and withdrawal, anger, bargaining, and finally depression before acceptance.²⁴⁰

Expect prejudice. When self-esteem is low, the pastor should expect prejudice, i.e., unfair views of others, to be high.²⁴¹ One protection against being attacked by "dragons" in the church is to share church leadership. Bergstrom says this "tends to disperse the voltage when lightning strikes."²⁴²

Expect to be viewed only as the authority figure: The shame-prone, assuming they got that way because of how they were raised, tend to recreate familial patterns with everyone. So expect to be put in the place of a shaming, negative, abandoning, critical parent. Expect the shame-prone person to try to make the pastor, as well as others, responsible. This is actually a sign of dependence.²⁴³ It takes great pastoral courage to be loving to someone so rejecting.

Be willing to visit: The one thing that is hardest is to be with a shame-prone person when that person is feeling paranoid and criticizing everything that breathes; but that is when real ministry can be done. Simply being with the shame-prone person in their pain is healing.²⁴⁴ Intermittent visiting is best because too many visits can be viewed as paternalistic and condescending. However, giving up after a visit or two will be viewed as confirmation of abandonment. Intermittent visiting makes each visit stand out.

Recognize dangerous situations: The following situations are typically times when the shame-prone person might have difficulty: when the shame-prone person is with an actual parent; during a church meeting where there is conflict with anyone in authority; in the tension of a new relationship, e.g., trying to be nice to visitors; when someone praises them (typically, they think the person is being sarcastic); when someone has said something hurtful; in the midst of success; and seeing someone else get angry, or being angry.²⁴⁵

Be empathetic when confronting: Negative confrontation says, "Aha! I caught you contradicting yourself!" or, "I caught you in a lie!" Empathetic confrontation, however, according to David Martin, says "I can understand your confusion when you feel both X and Y at the same time."²⁴⁶ If the person is yelling at the pastor, "You don't love me," the response should not be "That's a lie!" but rather simply, "I know it seems that I don't, but I do love you and I came here so you would know I love you."

Follow therapeutic guidelines: A partial catalog of therapeutic guidelines might look like the following thirty suggestions gleaned from all over:

- 1) develop a trusting relationship; 2) do not try to destroy shame defenses but give love instead; 3) identify shame in the present and label it as such; 4) connect present shame to childhood shame; 5) relate to shame as you would to grief; 6) identify positive resources past and present; 7) help to form a new identity formed around esteem and love;²⁴⁷ 8) listen; 9) give no premature

reassurance; 10) accept distrust; 11) be careful with compliments lest they be read as sarcasm; 12) be genuine; 13) avoid pity; 14) avoid excessive self-disclosure; 15) watch for dissociation — i.e., looking away, leaving the present — and bring them back to reality; 16) deal with nonverbal issues quickly; 17) accept an exchange of shame for guilt;²⁴⁸ 18) help them to abandon the search for justice; 19) teach humor; 20) fold them into the right small group for them when they have developed some self-esteem;²⁴⁹ 21) teach them to despise the shame; 22) never deal with their rage but only with their injured self within; 23) be non-threatening, non-argumentative, and non-condemning; 24) do not ask them to forgive but do point them toward Christ's goal of reconciliation; 25) teach the advantages of being accountable — commitment, fulfillment of obligation, repair of wrongs, and forgiveness — as opposed to being perfect;²⁵⁰ 26) teach tricks for handling criticism;²⁵¹ 27) adjust to different gender needs of men and women shame-prone; 28) request their help as a sign of respect and esteem; 29) say "I am sorry" when appropriate but never cringe or bootlick; and 30) teach assertiveness.²⁵²

Stress worship, friends at church, and developing autonomy: Based on the results of the questionnaire of chapter seven, there were three things that seemed to be reasons why highly shame-prone people tend to stay in church. The highly shame-prone kept coming back because of the need to worship God. They kept coming because of deep love relationships with at least one person at church who would miss them if they did not come. And lastly, they kept coming because although shame-prone, they were overcoming it with a developing healthy self-identity. These three things should be taken very seriously, considering their source — namely, the highly shame-prone who also regularly attend church.

Recognize differing gender needs: It was mentioned in chapter three that different cultural training for men and women has resulted in different ways of handling shame. Expect men to prefer blaming incidents on circumstances and not on other people, but expect women to prefer blaming others or having someone else accept the blame. Expect men to take action but expect women to get depressed. Expect women to make excuses for themselves, but expect men to justify themselves as being in the right. Realize that women typically will depend on someone else to fix the situation, and will also take on the burden of a loved

one's shame as their own. All of the above statements are based on psychological studies (see pp. 47-50 above), but realize that there are individual exceptions to each statement. Might women pastors reach shame-prone women best?

Give genuine love: Perhaps, boiling down this whole dissertation, it could be said that real and mature love is the antidote to shame. "For God so loved the world...." (John 3:16). This does not need a lot of explanation.

The writer has been saving an illustration of this point from Shakespeare. When Juliet's nurse expressed outrage at Romeo as the source of her charge's romantic troubles, she said, "These griefs, these woes, these sorrows make me old. Shame come to Romeo!" Whereupon Juliet replied,

Blister'd be thy tongue for such a wish! he was not born to shame:
Upon his brow shame is asham'd to sit; for 'tis a throne where hon-
our may be crown'd sole monarch of the universal earth.²⁵³

Her love for Romeo caused her to declare that, for her, Romeo would never be considered an object of reproach or shame. Love burns shame clear away when it is real. Unfortunately, every shame-prone person will know this only when someone demonstrates it to them.

III. Pastors Administering a Church With Shame-Prone Members

Protect the Security Framework of the Church

A church has a personality and in some ways relates to its pastor as one person relates to another. The pastor must take responsibility to secure the framework of relationship with the church. This means not only keeping confidences out of the pulpit, but keeping confidences on every occasion. Do not talk about church members and do not allow it in your presence. Before long, church members will realize they can trust the pastor to keep confidences.

Other areas in which the framework must be kept are: saying to one and all the same thing concerning the church; not trying to be intimate friends with

church members but accepting the professional relationship at all times; not pushing personal material in sermons, meetings, or on intimate occasions with church members; remaining in emotional control; and, perhaps most difficult, forgetting about promotion and remaining for several years at the church. The key concept here is stability.

Help the Church to Be Risk-Free for Mistakes

Do not allow shame-prone persons to generate an atmosphere of fear in the church, in which every word and expression must be guarded. To illustrate an atmosphere that is risk-free for mistakes: this writer was conducting a revival but the local pastor's wife, Linda, who was a softball coach, had not yet arrived to play the piano. A church member moved up to the piano, but just then the pastor's wife came in the door. The pastor, full of himself, deliberately swaggered and said in a loud voice, "Well, now you're finally here I guess you can come up here and play this piano and we can get started." His wife replied with perfect equanimity, "Well, since I didn't hear 'please,' I just think I'll stay back here." The church member stood up from the piano bench and said, "Linda, will you please come play the piano?" Linda replied, "Of course," and went to the front. It is difficult to describe the wonderful warm feelings this silly repartee introduced into the service. The whole thing was an act and everyone was tickled. The atmosphere stayed warm and free all that evening.

Make Positive Assumptions About the Inactive

In his book, Assimilating New Members, Lyle Schaller says that it is easy to view the absence of an inactive member as their own fault. Instead, Schaller says, one should assume the following about inactives:

- 1) Assume inactives joined the church in good faith.
- 2) Assume every inactive has a good reason for being inactive.
- 3) Assume that blaming the person will produce more inactivity.
- 4) Assume that speculating is not as good as asking outright why

- 5) Assume that excuses will be given first before the real reason.
- 6) Assume that more learning will be done by listening than talking.
- 7) Assume six to ten hours of listening is needed, not two or three.
- 8) Assume the real reason will appear the fourth visit, not the first.
- 9) Assume the longer we wait, the harder it will be to help.
- 10) Assume you need to call before hurt feelings get set.
- 11) Assume you need to be soothing and not irritating.
- 12) Assume inactives give signals which, if ignored, leads to great rigidity against returning.
- 13) Assume we need to know our own blind spots.
- 14) Assume we can only control our own responses.²⁵⁴

One item on the list above was left out purposely. Schaller says it is best to visit in teams. This is not so for the shame-prone; more than one person makes them feel attacked.²⁵⁵

Deal Differently With the Merely Embarrassed

Not all persons who have been embarrassed or humiliated at church are shame-prone persons. They should not be treated with the same kid-glove treatment given to the shame-prone. Simply making sure that an apology is offered is usually enough for a normal person. The pastor can make sure that restitution is at least offered; sometimes a thoughtful restitution can melt away all hard feeling. With the normal as well as with the shame-prone, the pastor should be unflappable; he or she should show no embarrassment, and encourage the person who needs to make amends to show no embarrassment.²⁵⁶ If embarrassed, simply admit it.

The pastor should take care to see that simple forgiveness occurs. Whereas the shame-prone, if asked to forgive, is likely to fall into deeper shame, concluding that God favors the other person, "the criminal," and has rejected him or her "the victim,"²⁵⁷ a normal person will readily accept the encouragement to forgive.

Conclusion

The pastor does not have to fear or shun the dragons of the church. One of the sweetest things on earth is turning a frightened, contemptuous, threatening person from acting like an enemy to being a loyal friend. The pastor who would experience this must understand shame-based issues, recognize shame-proneness, and know how to deal with shame so as to turn it into self-confident love.

Conclusion to the Dissertation

The most important thing in the whole world is to be accepted by God. C. S. Lewis has said,

In the end that Face which is the delight or terror of the universe must be turned upon each of us either with one expression or with the other, either conferring glory inexpressible or inflicting shame that can never be cured or disguised.²⁵²

Pastors can help the shame-prone to learn how much God loves them and wants to be their accepting Father. Pastors can teach the shame-prone that grace means not only forgiveness of sins being offered in Christ, but also a new identity — a new birth — being offered in Christ as well. Pastors can teach the shame-prone how to accept God's offer of wholeness in Christ. Pastors can teach the shame-prone to lose their fear of abandonment and annihilation in Him who has said, "I will never leave you nor forsake you."

When pastors learn to reach out to the shame-prone, they will have done what Christ did when he left the ninety and nine to go and find the one lost sheep. Pastors will find it is much easier to minister to all the ninety and nine after risking reaching out to that one lost sheep. Perhaps the meaning of the parable is that in God's economy, one sheep is equal in value to all the rest. If this is so, then it is imperative to begin searching for that one.

The LORD bless thee, and keep thee:

The LORD make his face shine upon thee,

And be gracious unto thee:

The LORD lift up his countenance upon thee,

And give thee peace.

APPENDIX A

TOSCA¹

(TEST OF SELF-CONSCIOUS AFFECT)

Below are situations that people are likely to encounter in day-to-day life, followed by several common reactions to those situations.

As you read each scenario, try to imagine yourself in that situation. Then indicate how likely you would be to react in each of the ways described. We ask you to rate all responses because people may feel or react more than one way to the same situation, or they may react different ways at different times.

Please do not skip any items -- rate all your responses.

1. You make plans to meet a friend for lunch. At 5 o'clock, you realize you stood him up.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would think: "I'm inconsiderate." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "Well, they'll understand." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would try to make it up to him as soon as possible. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "My boss distracted me just before lunch." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

2. You break something at work and then hide it.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would think: "This is making me anxious. I need to either fix it or get someone else to." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think about quitting. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think: "A lot of things aren't aren't made very well these days." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "It was only an accident." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

continue to next page...

¹Tangney, J.P., Wagner, P.E., & Gramzow, R. (1989)

3. You are out with friends one evening and you're feeling especially witty and attractive. Your best friend's spouse seems to particularly enjoy your company.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would think: "I should have been aware of what my best friend is feeling." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would feel happy with your appearance and personality. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel pleased to have made such a good impression. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think your best friend should pay attention to his/her spouse. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| e) You would probably avoid eye-contact for a long time. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

4. At work, you wait until the last minute to plan a project, and it turns out badly.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would feel incompetent. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "There are never enough hours in the day." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel: "I deserve to be reprimanded." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "What's done is done." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

5. You make a mistake at work and find out a co-worker is blamed for the error.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would think the company did not like the co-worker. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "Life is not fair." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would keep quiet and avoid the co-worker. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would feel unhappy and eager to correct the situation. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

continue to next page...

6. For several days you put off making a difficult phone call. At the last minute you make the call and are able to manipulate the conversation so that all goes well.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would think: "I guess I'm more persuasive than I thought." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would regret that you put it off. ² | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel like a coward. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "I did a good job." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| e) You would think you shouldn't have to make calls you feel pressured into. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

7. You make a commitment to diet, but when you pass the bakery you buy a dozen donuts.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) Next meal, you would eat celery to make up for it. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "They looked too good to pass by." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel disgusted with your lack of will power and self-control. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "Once won't matter." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

8. While playing around, you throw a ball and it hits your friend in the face.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would feel inadequate that you can't even throw a ball. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think maybe your friend needs more practice at catching. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think: "It was just an accident." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would apologize and make sure your friend feels better. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely
continue to next page... |

²Inadvertently omitted in the testing. Dr. Tangney pointed out to the author in a phone conversation, March 22, 1991, that this would not affect test results significantly for the purposes of the dissertation.

9. You have recently moved away from your family and everyone has been very helpful. A few times you needed to borrow money but you paid it back as soon as you could.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would feel immature. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "I sure ran into some bad luck." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would return the favor as quickly as you could. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "I am a trustworthy person." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| e) You would be proud that you repaid your debts. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

10. You are driving down the road and you hit a small animal.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would think the animal shouldn't have been on the road. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "I'm terrible." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel: "Well, it was an accident." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would probably think it over several times wondering if you could have avoided it. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

11. You walk out of an exam thinking you did extremely well. Then you find out you did poorly.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would think: "Well, it's just a test." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would think: "The instructor doesn't like me." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think: "I should have studied harder." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would feel stupid. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

continue to next page...

12. You and a group of co-workers worked very hard on a project. Your boss singles you out for a bonus because the project was such a success.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would feel the boss is rather short-sighted. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would feel alone and apart from your colleagues. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would feel your hard work had paid off. ³ | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would feel competent and proud of yourself. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| e) You would feel you should not accept it. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

13. While out with a group of friends, you make fun of a friend who's not there.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would think: "It was all in fun; it's harmless. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would feel small ... like a rat. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think that perhaps that friend should have been there to defend himself/herself. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would apologize and talk about that person's good points. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

14. You make a big mistake on an important project at work. People were depending on you and your boss criticizes you.

- | | |
|--|--|
| a) You would think your boss should have been more clear about what was expected of you. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would feel like you wanted to hide. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think: "I should have recognized the problem and done a better job." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would think: "Well, nobody's perfect." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

³Inadvertently omitted in the testing. Dr. Tangney pointed out to the author in a phone conversation, March 22, 1991, that this would not affect test results significantly for the purposes of the dissertation.

15. You volunteer to help with the local Special Olympics for handicapped children. It turns out to be frustrating and time-consuming work. You think seriously about quitting, but then you see how happy the kids are.

- | | |
|---|--|
| a) You would feel selfish and you'd think you are basically lazy. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| b) You would feel you were forced into doing something you did not want to do. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| c) You would think: "I should be more concerned about people who are less fortunate." | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| d) You would feel great that you had helped others. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |
| e) You would feel very satisfied with yourself. | 1----2----3----4----5
not likely very likely |

Scoring the TOSCA⁴

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. a) Shame
b) Detached
c) Guilt
d) Externalization | 9. a) Shame
b) Externalization
c) Guilt
d) Alpha Pride
e) Beta Pride |
| 2. a) Guilt
b) Shame
c) Externalization
d) Detached | 10. a) Externalization
b) Shame
c) Detached
d) Guilt |
| 3. a) Guilt
b) Alpha Pride
c) Beta Pride
d) Externalization
e) Shame | 11. a) Detached
b) Externalization
c) Guilt
d) Shame |
| 4. a) Shame
b) Externalization
c) Guilt
d) Detached | 12. a) Externalization
b) Shame
c) Beta Pride
d) Alpha Pride
e) Guilt |
| 5. a) Externalization
b) Detached
c) Shame
d) Guilt | 13. a) Detached
b) Shame
c) Externalization
d) Guilt |
| 6. a) Alpha Pride
b) Guilt
c) Shame
d) Beta Pride
e) Externalization | 14. a) Externalization
b) Shame
c) Guilt
d) Detached |
| 7. a) Guilt
b) Externalization
c) Shame
d) Detached | 15. a) Shame
b) Externalization
c) Guilt
d) Beta Pride
e) Alpha Pride |
| 8. a) Shame
b) Externalization
c) Detached
d) Guilt | |

⁴Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P.E., & Gramzow, R. (1989)

APPENDIX B

ARSP

(Attendance Related Shame Proneness)

Please circle the one number that most closely expresses your feelings:

- | | |
|---|--|
| 1. People at church are often unfairly critical of each other. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 2. People at church are often unfairly critical of me. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 3. When someone offends me, it is harder for me to return to church. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 4. It's not easy to say exactly why I miss church. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 5. I admit my feelings are still hurt over some past church incidents. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 6. During my life, my reputation has been unfairly damaged by people. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 7. People at church like to gossip about each other, and about me. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 8. Some of our church members' behavior in the past has made me feel ashamed. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 9. If certain people were not in my church, I would go more often. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
| 10. Certain people at church have humiliated and embarrassed me. | 1----2----3----4----5
disagree agree |
-

Scoring the ARSP

To score the ARSP, simply take the total of the numbers for each response. For example, if for each statement the number "1" was circled, the score would be 10. If for each statement the number "5" was circled, the score would be 50.

APPENDIX C

PEABODY

For each statement, please circle the number that best describes your feelings about that statement. Be sure to circle one number for each statement.

- | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-------|
| 1. The people in the church show an interest in me. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 2. I don't feel "good enough" to go to church. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 3. People at church think they are better than I am. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 4. My feelings get hurt at church. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 5. A lot of people who go to church are hypocrites. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 6. A small clique of persons actually run the church. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 7. I have lost some of my faith in God. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 8. I consider myself an active church member. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 9. I don't feel my church really needs me. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
| | | |
| 10. Church members don't visit people like they should. | 1----2----3----4----5 | |
| | disagree | agree |
-

Scoring the Peabody

To score the Peabody, get the total of scores for each statement except for statements #1 and #8. For statements #1 and #8, switch the Likert scale so that a "1" would score as a "5" and a "5" would score as a "1". For example, if the subject encircled "1" on all ten statements, the score would be 8 for the eight regular statements plus 10 for the switched statements, for a total of 18.

APPENDIX D

DATA FROM TOSCA, ARSP, AND PEABODY TESTS

Raw Data from Peaceful UMC and Grader's Chapel UMC⁵

Forms sent: 134; usable forms received: 78; percent response: 58.21%.

PERSN	ATT	S	D	G	E	Al	Be	AR	PE	AR+PE	Al+Be
001G	96	41	22	50	38	12	12	25	26	51	24
002G	88	41	30	55	42	13	12	17	15	32	25
003G	18	30	33	57	32	16	13	15	16	31	29
007G	72	58	46	66	68	21	16	14	18	32	37
008G	64	63	38	66	43	21	16	21	18	39	37
010G	52	25	33	38	40	22	17	15	17	32	39
011G	80	32	26	55	27	20	17	15	16	31	37
016G	96	36	26	45	46	15	13	19	19	38	28
017G	96	48	37	50	50	13	12	22	20	42	25
021G	84	66	38	65	43	17	12	10	14	24	29
022G	80	36	28	58	40	15	15	14	19	33	30
023G	64	36	30	45	40	16	13	11	16	27	29
024G	60	41	42	50	51	17	17	10	18	28	34
029G	64	44	23	56	44	15	13	10	18	28	28
030G	23	53	26	62	39	16	17	13	21	34	33
031G	84	36	26	60	34	16	13	10	14	24	29
032G	48	33	24	49	31	17	11	13	22	35	28
035G	60	48	44	51	53	23	18	19	17	36	41
036G	36	41	37	54	35	15	12	24	26	50	27
037G	36	31	24	66	38	21	16	16	20	36	37
038G	72	67	42	66	51	21	16	18	18	36	37
039G	24	47	38	46	47	19	16	22	16	38	35
040G	52	38	36	51	40	21	15	10	15	25	36
043G	32	40	31	58	43	18	16	10	17	27	34
044G	36	38	28	51	35	15	12	10	15	25	27
045G	40	41	37	55	42	20	18	25	18	43	38
046G	32	51	40	53	45	19	18	16	20	36	37
047G	44	38	29	46	30	19	15	16	15	31	34
048G	72	49	32	60	52	18	15	23	23	46	33
049G	84	33	22	61	49	18	16	12	17	29	34
050P	00	28	25	53	21	15	16	10	14	24	31
051P	16	32	44	62	44	14	16	25	22	47	30
052P	19	47	21	55	43	18	16	20	18	38	34
055P	00	36	35	59	32	24	20	30	33	63	44
057P	22	48	31	56	48	21	17	46	42	88	38
058P	63	43	33	54	50	19	18	15	17	32	37
059P	00	42	30	61	35	22	18	22	20	42	40
060P	00	41	29	59	30	22	19	17	18	36	41
062P	00	53	28	63	41	14	16	25	20	45	30
067P	89	47	26	55	39	17	16	23	16	39	33

⁵The key to the abbreviations is at the end of this appendix.

PERSN	ATT	S	D	G	E	Al	Be	AR	PE	AR+PE	Al+Be
068P	85	43	32	41	45	18	12	18	20	38	30
069P	00	67	21	63	34	11	15	36	33	69	26
072P	89	49	29	40	48	17	14	19	26	45	31
073P	77	34	23	62	39	18	17	12	17	29	35
074P	31	51	19	64	30	12	17	15	21	36	29
075P	85	37	35	46	41	17	16	16	18	34	33
076P	78	48	29	65	35	13	14	15	21	36	27
078P	00	50	27	56	43	17	15	27	23	50	32
079P	00	49	28	56	41	17	16	30	18	48	33
081P	00	55	29	66	32	15	13	12	22	34	28
082P	81	43	33	53	44	18	14	21	19	40	32
083P	11	38	37	63	41	19	18	13	24	37	37
084P	11	44	30	64	48	23	19	16	25	41	42
091P	81	49	22	64	42	12	14	21	22	43	26
092P	78	48	28	55	45	16	14	25	19	44	30
094P	11	50	39	41	46	18	15	41	34	75	33
095P	74	50	34	40	55	18	15	40	34	74	33
096P	85	26	13	65	23	9	12	13	19	32	21
097P	89	38	28	51	39	20	18	18	19	37	38
098P	26	36	42	58	48	23	20	27	23	50	43
099P	70	45	35	55	42	17	15	12	17	29	32
100P	41	47	23	50	42	20	12	14	18	32	32
104P	74	36	25	52	41	18	15	30	21	51	33
105P	67	42	26	59	39	15	13	20	21	41	28
106P	74	36	22	58	24	11	13	22	18	40	24
107P	93	49	39	46	57	25	19	19	14	33	44
108P	74	49	38	48	54	21	19	14	14	28	38
111P	74	23	18	57	38	18	16	17	24	41	34
112P	19	39	30	49	42	17	14	31	25	56	31
113P	07	42	19	54	37	14	12	29	23	52	26
114P	04	34	37	53	58	16	18	31	29	60	34
115P	04	49	27	63	46	20	18	37	32	69	38
116P	19	25	19	42	25	16	13	23	23	46	29
117P	19	51	27	58	37	14	14	30	29	59	28
119P	00	55	27	56	45	18	16	19	28	47	34
120P	48	41	24	55	43	19	15	26	27	53	34
121P	52	38	24	54	32	16	15	27	31	58	31
133P	44	67	47	65	67	25	12	14	18	32	37

Key to Abbreviations

Al = Alpha pride scale, TOSCA
 Al+Be = Alpha pride score plus Beta pride score, TOSCA
 AR = Attendance-Related Shame-Proneness scale, by author
 AR+PE = AR scores plus PE scores
 ATT = Attendance scores. The number represents percent of perfect attendance.

Be = Beta pride scale, TOSCA
 D = Detached scale, TOSCA
 E = Externalization scale, TOSCA
 G = Guilt scale, TOSCA
 PE = Peabody scale, by author
 S = Shame-proneness scale, TOSCA

APPENDIX E

LETTERS SENT BEFORE AND AFTER TESTING

Rev. Wallace Cason
(Address)

^D

^F1^

^F2^

Dear ^F3^,

May I ask your help in a very important project? As you probably know, I am writing my doctoral dissertation. The subject is the effects of embarrassment on church attendance. Since you are on the roll as a church member residing within driving distance of church, you can help me conduct a little scientific experiment if you would.

If you would be willing to participate, please fill out the enclosed questionnaires and send them back to me in the stamped envelope provided. Please do it as soon as possible, since I need your data right away in order to continue working on my dissertation.

No individual names will appear in my dissertation. I just need the total numbers I collect from adding up all the answers, and that is all. I do hereby promise you total confidentiality, but in return I need total frankness in your answers or else the data won't mean anything.

This will take you some time, but I hope you have as much fun filling it out as I expect to have getting the results. I can't tell you yet what conclusions I expect to see, because it would spoil the experiment; however, I can tell you now that my professors at Asbury are very interested in what the results will be. If you will fill out the questionnaires, and send them in to me, you will get a letter giving the results when I get it all together. So please help me, and thanks in advance!

Sincerely yours,

^T^N^P^P

SECOND QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SELECTED CHURCH MEMBERS

Dear faithful member of Peaceful,

The reason you have been chosen for this second questionnaire is that you have scored very high on church attendance, coming to church a very high percent of the time; yet you also scored high on the TOSCA test I gave on embarrassment -- meaning that the answers you gave would indicate to the person who made the test that you are probably frequently prone to feeling ashamed or insulted or embarrassed, but you still regularly come to church in spite of this!

I would be most appreciative if you would try to answer the following questions to the best of your ability. Because your scores go against what I thought I would find, naturally I would be very interested in your responses, and even excited by your thoughts.

You need not put your name on this form, and your answers will be kept completely confidential. I will not even keep track of which form came from you. But it is essential to my dissertation that I try to understand how a person easily embarrassed by fellow church members would nevertheless attend church regularly. Because of your unique and unexpected scores, you can help me greatly and hopefully contribute to a better understanding of what motivates people to go to church.

Please prayerfully consider these questions and answer as well as you can. I would be delighted if you had some more thoughts and wrote them on the back. Your ideas about why you go to church so much even though people might have hurt your feelings is of great, great interest to me! Thank you! -- Bro. Wally

1. On a scale of one to ten, how easy is it for others to make you feel humiliated or ashamed or offended (angry) when someone snubs you, insults you, humiliates you, criticizes you, gossips about you, or ignores you? (Not what you show to others, but what you really feel inside?) If you circle the one, it would mean you have a very thick skin; circling the ten would mean you have a really thin skin. Please circle the number below that usually describes you best:

(not hurt) 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 (very hurt)

2. We all have had things happen to us in church which cause us to feel that others are showing contempt for us, are not considering our feelings, or are not showing us normal and proper respect. Can you give an example of this kind of incident which might happen at church to cause you or someone else embarrassment? (Look at the top of the next page for help in remembering.)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

(Please feel free to use the back if you think of more.)

Here are some types of humiliation:

- 1) people ignoring you, e.g. walking past you without speaking
- 2) people saying something rude or contemptuous to you in front of others or privately
- 3) people not including you, e.g., not calling you to let you know of an event
- 4) someone giving you orders and trying to boss you around
- 5) someone not consulting you or considering you in making a decision
- 6) someone saying mean and unfair things about you to others behind your back
- 7) someone physically threatening you or taking over something that is yours
- 8) something happening to you which causes you to feel very uncomfortable, looked at by everyone, that people are ashamed for you, that you wish you weren't there
- 9) something you did which others saw and about which you feel ashamed and embarrassed, or wish you could erase
- 10) something someone else did which made you feel very embarrassed for them and which caused painful memories of other past embarrassments

3. What has actually happened to you like the above to cause you to feel humiliated?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

(Please feel free to use the back if you think of more.)

4. What are some of the reasons why you might still keep going to church even though someone offended you in this way?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

(Please feel free to use the back if you think of more.)

5. What is the most important reason why you might ignore slights and hurts of this kind and keep on coming to church? (It might be one of your answers to 4. just above, or it might be another reason not yet mentioned.)

1. _____

Please feel free to use the back if you think of other possible reasons. Then please return the form to me or slip it under my office door. -- Thanks!

Rev. Wallace Cason

August 1991

Dear church member,

A while ago you consented graciously to fill out some forms and answer some questions for me, to help me do my Doctor of Ministry dissertation. I promised you I would report to you on the results of those tests. Here is the abstract, or summary, of my dissertation:

ABSTRACT

Why do people drop out of church? Results of case study interviews, statistical testing, and questionnaires indicate that persons are more likely to drop out if they are shame-prone, have severe interpersonal conflicts, have lost status in church through personal failures, or are married women.

A statistical study of two small rural United Methodist congregations using the TOSCA, Test of Self-Conscious Affect (June Price Tangney et. al., George Mason University, 1989), showed contrary to expectations that attendance per se did not correlate inversely with shame-proneness as expected. In a further study of seventeen church dropouts, dropout women had very high shame-proneness (almost one standard deviation above average) while having below average alpha pride (pride in the entire self rather than in behavior). Dropout men had the reverse, with above average alpha pride and below average shame-proneness. Wives were discovered to be responsible more often for a couple dropping out of church, which corroborates psychological studies of shame-proneness in women.

Church members who were high in shame-proneness yet also faithful attenders showed they had: 1) a strong desire to worship God, 2) stable relationships with at least one other church member, and 3) a growing autonomous self-identity which overcame temptation to withdraw after embarrassing incidents or church fights.

Shame is surveyed in the fields of philosophy, anthropology, fiction and nonfiction, sociology, and psychology. A biblical word study, a study of Christian leaders through history, and comments towards a theology of shame are included. If America is becoming a shame culture, then America needs an evangelism drawing on a more biblical understanding of a healthy identity in Christ versus a shame-based identity, rather than an evangelism that only draws on a sin-guilt-mercy-forgiveness message. A final chapter gives pastoral counseling and administrative techniques for healing and rejuvenating shame-prone persons.

If you have any comments or questions I would be glad to receive them. Thank you from the bottom of my heart for your help — it was absolutely critical to making this project a success, and I will be forever grateful to you.

Your pastor,

Rev. Wallace Cason

NOTES

CHAPTER ONE

¹ Cheryl Capshaw, "Strategy for Small Membership Churches Considered," United Methodist Advocate, September 13, 1989, p. 1. The name of the state in which this Advocate is printed is omitted for purposes of confidentiality.

² John S. Savage, The Apathetic and Bored Church Member (Pittsford, New York: LEAD Consultants, Inc., 1976).

³ Proverbs 11:2, "When pride cometh, then cometh shame; but with the lowly is wisdom." All biblical quotations will be from the King James Version.

⁴ There can be no doubt that modesty is connected to shame. According to the article "Shame," Oxford English Dictionary, Compact Edition (Oxford: University Press, 1971), Vol. II, p. 2767, the word "shame" comes from a Teutonic root ham, which means 'covering oneself'. Shame is defined in the O. E. D., *ibid.*, as "The painful emotion arising from the consciousness of something dishonouring, ridiculous, or indecorous in one's own conduct or circumstances (or in those of others whose honour or disgrace one regards as one's own), or of being in a situation which offends one's sense of modesty or decency." For more extensive information concerning the English, German, and Greek roots of the word "shame," see Kurt Reizler, "Comment on the Social Psychology of Shame," American Journal of Sociology 48 (Jan. 1943): 457-465.

⁵ Thomas D. Cook and Charles S. Reichardt, Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research (Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, 1979), 14.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 13, quoting S. E. Fienberg, "The Collection and Analysis of Ethnographic Data in Educational Research," Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8 (1977): 50-57.

⁷ Peer Hultberg, "Shame — A Hidden Emotion," Journal of Analytical Psychology 33 (1988): 109-126. See chapter two, p. 18, for the story about Eskimo song duels.

⁸ David H. Demo, "The Measurement of Self-Esteem: Refining Our Methods," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 48 (1985): 1500.

⁹ Joint Committee on Testing Practices of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education, "Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education," The Tenth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Jane Close Conoley and Jack J. Kramer, eds. (Lincoln: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, 1989), 1011-1014.

¹⁰ I Samuel 2:3, "Talk no more so exceeding proudly; let not arrogancy come out of your mouth: for the LORD is a God of knowledge, and by him actions are weighed."

Isaiah 40:28, "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding."

¹¹ See the statement, "God is God of all truth," David Seamands, Healing Grace (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1989), 187.

¹² Gerard Egan, The Skilled Helper, 3rd ed. (Pacific Grove: Brooks / Cole, 1986), 141. Quoting G. A. Talland and D. H. Clark, "Evaluation of Topics in Therapy Group Discussion," Journal of Clinical Psychology 10 (1954): 131-137.

¹³ Leon Wurmser, M. D., The Mask of Shame (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1981), p. vii. Quoting tractates Sotah and Baba Metzia, from the Talmud.

¹⁴ Silvan Tomkins, Silvan S., introd., Gershen Kaufman, Shame: The Power of Caring (Rochester, VT: Schenkman Books, 1985), xv.

¹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶ John Deigh, "Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique," Ethics 93 (Jan. 1983): 238.

CHAPTER TWO

¹⁷ Ibid., 233. Quoting Plato, Crito 45d-3. Hugh Trednick, The Collected Dialogues of Plato, ed. Edith Hamilton and Huntington Cairnes (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 30.

¹⁸ Ibid., 242, n. Quoting Thomas Hobbes, Leviathan, ch. 6.

¹⁹ Ibid. Quoting Descartes, pt. 3, art. 205.

²⁰ Ibid. Quoting Plato, Euthyphro 12a-d.

²¹ Ibid. Quoting Havelock Ellis, "The Evolution of Modesty," Studies of the Psychology of Sex, 3rd ed. (New York: Random House, 1942), vol 1, 36-52, 72.

²² Ibid, 243. Charles Darwin, The Expression of the Emotions in Man and Animal (1872; reprint, Chicago: University of Chicago, 1965), 331.

²³ Leon Wurmser, M. D., The Mask of Shame (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1981), 98. Quoting Nietzsche, Dawn. n. d.

²⁴ Phil Mollon, "Shame in Relation to Narcissistic Disturbance," British Journal of Medical Psychology 57 (1984): 211. Quoting Jean-Paul Sartre, On

Being and Nothingness (New York: Philosophical Library, 1956), section entitled "Being for Others."

²⁵ Ibid., 208. Quoting Sartre, *ibid.*

²⁶ Gershen Kaufman, The Psychology of Shame (New York: Springer, 1989), 16. Referring to a study done by P. Ekman, "Universals and Cultural Differences in Facial Expressions of Emotion," in J. K. Cole (ed.), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation (Lincoln: U. of Nebraska, 1971) Vol. 19, 207-283.

²⁷ Billy Zonie et al., The Tale of the Possum (Philadelphia, MS: Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, 1985), 12.

²⁸ Hultberg, *op. cit.*, 117. Reference to A. Heller, The Power of Shame: A Rational Perspective (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 13.

²⁹ Ibid., 113. Reference to M. Hindsberger, Gronlands Religion (Copenhagen. Gad, 1977), 14, and I. Kleivan, "Song Duels in West Greenland — Joking Relationship and Avoidance," Folk (Copenhagen, 1971) 13, 18.

³⁰ Ruth Benedict, The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977), 3.

³¹ Hultberg, *op. cit.*, 113.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., 114.

³⁴ Ibid., 113.

³⁵ David P. Ausubel, "Relationships Between Shame and Guilt in the Socializing Process," Psychological Review 62 (1955): 387 Reference to Ruth Benedict, The Chrysanthemum and the Sword (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1946), 223.

³⁶ Nathaniel Hawthorne, The Scarlet Letter (1850; reprint, New York: New American Library, Nal Penguin, 1980), p. 74.

³⁷ Ibid., 63.

³⁸ Kaufman, *op. cit.*, 7.

³⁹ Joseph Conrad, Lord Jim (1899; reprint, New York: Bantam, Doubleday, 1981), 17.

⁴⁰ Hultberg, *op. cit.*, 115. Quoting John Keats, The Letters of John Keats 1814 - 1821, Vol. I, in C. Ricks, Keats and Embarrassment (Oxford: Clarendon), 21.

⁴¹ John Deigh, *op. cit.*, 232. Quoting Andre Gide, Lafcadio's Adventures, trans. Dorothy Bussy (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1953), 100.

⁴² Hawthorne, op. cit., 66 f.

⁴³ Ibid., 74.

⁴⁴ William Shakespeare, Hamlet, Wm. Farnham, ed. (New York: Viking Penguin, 1985), Act 5, Scene 2.

⁴⁵ William Shakespeare, "King Lear," Act I, Scene 1.

⁴⁶ Hultberg, op. cit., 125.

⁴⁷ Ibid., 120. Quoting Virginia Woolf in A. O. Bell (ed.), The Diary of Virginia Woolf, vol. 5 (London: Hogarth, 1984), 63-68.

⁴⁸ Kurt Reizler, "Comment on the Social Psychology of Shame," American Journal of Sociology 48 (Jan. 1943): 461. Quoting Shakespeare, "Romeo and Juliet."

⁴⁹ Eldridge Cleaver, Soul on Ice (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968), 205-210.

⁵⁰ No doubt the monologue will soon appear in print, as many of Keillor's monologues do.

CHAPTER THREE

⁵¹ C. S. Lewis, A Grief Observed (1961; reprint, New York: Bantam, 1976), 9.

⁵² Nancy J. Stiehler-Thurston, "From Disgrace to Grace: Theory and Treatment of Shame," Annual Convention of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Dearborn, MI, May 3-6, 1990, 3.

⁵³ Sally K. Severino, M. D., Edith R. McNutt, M. D., & Samuel L. Feder, M. D., "Shame and the Development of Autonomy," Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis 15 (1987): 93-106.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 94. References to:

Leon Wurmser, The Mask of Shame (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1981).

W. Kinston, "A Context for Shame," International Journal of Psychoanalysis 64 (1983): 213-226.

A. P. Morrison, "Shame, the Ideal Self, and Narcissism," Contemporary Psychoanalysis 19 (1983): 295-318.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 8.

⁵⁶ James M. Harper and Margaret H. Hoopes, Uncovering Shame: An Approach Integrating Individuals and Their Family Systems (New York: W. W. Norton, 1990), 8. Reference to V. I. Friesen, "On Shame and the Family," Family Therapy 6:39-58.

- ⁵⁷ John Bradshaw, Healing the Shame that Binds You (Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, 1988), 5-9.
- ⁵⁸ Mary K. Babcock, "Embarrassment: A Window on the Self," Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour 18 (Dec. 1988): 459, 481;
Edward Gross & Gregory P. Stone, "Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements," The American Journal of Sociology 70 (July 1964): 1-15;
Thomas J. Scheff, "Shame and Conformity: The Deference-Emotions System," American Sociological Review 53 (June 1988): 395-6, 405.
- ⁵⁹ Bradshaw, op. cit., 9.
- ⁶⁰ Harper and Hoopes, op. cit., 9.
- ⁶¹ Ronald Potter-Efron and Patricia Potter-Efron, Letting Go of Shame: Understanding How Shame Affects Your Life (San Francisco: Hazelden, Harper & Row, 1989), chs. 3, 15.
- ⁶² Ibid.
- ⁶³ Kaufman, op. cit.
- ⁶⁴ Ibid., 8.
- ⁶⁵ Andrew P. Morrison, M. D., "Shame, Ideal Self, and Narcissism," Contemporary Psychoanalysis 19 (Apr. 1983): 296.
- ⁶⁶ Hultberg, op. cit., 111.
- ⁶⁷ Andrew P. Morrison, M. D., "Working with Shame in Psychoanalytic Treatment," Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association 32 (1984): 503.
- ⁶⁸ Sigmund Freud, "New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis," Standard Edition (London: Hogarth, 1964), 22:132.
- ⁶⁹ Alfred Adler, "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Inferiority Feeling," H. L. Andbacher and R. Ansbacher (eds.), Superiority and Social Interest (1933; reprint, Evanston: Northwestern University, 1970).
- ⁷⁰ Hultberg, op. cit., 112.
- ⁷¹ Kaufman, op. cit., 9. Quoting Karen Horney, Neurosis and Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization (New York: Norton, 1950), 95.
- ⁷² G. Piers and M. B. Singer, Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study (Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1953).
- ⁷³ Kaufman, op. cit., 9-10.
- ⁷⁴ Erik Erikson, Childhood and Society (1950; reprint, New York: W. W. Norton, 1963).

⁷⁵ Severino, McNutt, and Feder, op. cit., 95-6.

⁷⁶ Kaufman, op. cit., 10.

⁷⁷ Helen Merrell Lynd, On Shame and the Search for Identity (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958).

⁷⁸ Helen Block Lewis, Shame and Guilt in Neurosis (New York: International Universities Press, 1971).

⁷⁹ Kaufman, op. cit.

⁸⁰ H. B. Lewis, op. cit., 86.

⁸¹ Ibid., 7.

⁸² Morrison, "Shame, Ideal Self, and Narcissism," op. cit., 298.

⁸³ Ibid., 297.

⁸⁴ Ibid. Reference to H. Hartmann, "Comments on the Psychoanalytic Theory of the Ego," Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 17:42-81; E. Jacobson, "The Self and the Object World: Vicissitudes of Their Infantile Cathexis and Their Influences on Ideational and Affective Development," Psychoanalytic Study of the Child, 9:75-127.

⁸⁵ Leon Wurmser, M. D., The Mask of Shame (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1981).

⁸⁶ Kaufman, op. cit., 11.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 12.

⁸⁹ Ibid. Quoting Silvan Tomkins, "Shame," in D. L. Nathanson (ed.), The Many Faces of Shame (New York: Guilford, 1987), 137.

⁹⁰ Silvan S. Tomkins, Affect, Imagery, Consciousness: The Negative Affects 2 vols. (New York: Springer, 1963), 2:118.

⁹¹ John Bradshaw, Healing the Shame that Binds You (Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, 1988).

Eunice Cavanaugh, Understanding Shame: Why It Hurts, How It Helps, How You Can Use It to Transform Your Life (Minneapolis: Johnson Inst., 1989).

James M. Harper and Margaret H. Hoopes, Uncovering Shame: An Approach Integrating Individuals and Their Family Systems (New York: W. W. Norton, 1990).

Ronald Potter-Efron and Patricia Potter-Efron, Letting Go of Shame: Understanding How Shame Affects Your Life (San Francisco: Hazelden, Harper & Row, 1989).

⁹² Kaufman, op. cit., 17.

⁹³ Ibid., 35.

⁹⁴ Ibid., 37-47.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 84.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 85.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 106.

⁹⁸ Ibid., 100-104.

⁹⁹ Ibid., 18.

¹⁰⁰ Mollon, op. cit., 208.

¹⁰¹ John Patton, Is Human Forgiveness Possible? (Nashville: Abingdon, 1985), 147, 181.

¹⁰² Marshall Shelley, Helping Those Who Don't Want Help (Carol Stream: Word, Books, 1986), 97.

¹⁰³ David Augsburger, Anger and Assertiveness in Pastoral Care (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979), 4.

¹⁰⁴ Kaufman, op. cit., 76.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 95-8.

¹⁰⁶ Larry L. McSwain and William C. Treadwell, Jr., Conflict Ministry in the Church (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1981), 124.

¹⁰⁷ Some works which differentiate guilt from shame are:
Joan Borysenko, Guilt Is the Teacher, Love Is the Lesson (New York: Warner Books, 1990).

Cavanaugh, op. cit.

Harper and Hoopes, op. cit.

H. B. Lewis, op. cit.

Potter-Efron, op. cit.

Piers and Singer, op. cit.

¹⁰⁸ Harper and Hoopes, *ibid.*, 3.

¹⁰⁹ Cavanaugh, op. cit., 8. See also Hultberg, op. cit., abstract.

¹¹⁰ Mollon, op. cit., 207. Quoting Erik Erikson, Identity and the Life Cycle (New York: International Universities Press, 1959), n.d.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 208.

¹¹² Kaufman, op. cit., 17.

¹¹³ June Price Tangney, "Moral Affect: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly," paper presented at the 1988 meetings of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta, p. 16.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 15. Corroboration will be found in Jerome Sattler, "A Theoretical, Developmental, and Clinical Investigation of Embarrassment," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 71 (1965): 55.

¹¹⁵ Summary of Kaufman et al. The clearest single presentation of this may be found in Sebern F. Fisher, "Identity of Two: The Phenomenology of Shame in Borderline Development and Treatment," Psychotherapy 22 (Spr. 1985): 101-109.

¹¹⁶ A tip of the hat to "Miss Manners" for the phrase "insult collector."

¹¹⁷ Rowland S. Miller, "Empathic Embarrassment: Situational and Personal Determinants of Reactions to the Embarrassment of Another," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 53 (1987): 1061-1069.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 1067-8.

¹¹⁹ H. B. Lewis, op. cit.

¹²⁰ Herbert Anderson, "Human Forgiveness Is Possible," Journal of Pastoral Care 40 (June 1986): 177.

¹²¹ Tangney, op. cit., 10.

¹²² Edith S. L. Gomberg, "Shame and Guilt Issues Among Women Alcoholics," Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 143.

¹²³ Sandra Petronio, "Communication Strategies to Reduce Embarrassment Differences Between Men and Women," The Western Journal of Speech Communication 48 (Winter 1984): 36.

¹²⁴ Severino, McNutt, and Feder, op. cit., 94.

¹²⁵ Kaufman, op. cit., 100-04. See also:

Sidney Levin, "The Psychoanalysis of Shame," International Journal of Psychoanalysis 52 (1971): 355-362.

A. F. Valenstein, "Glossary of Defences [sic]," Psychoanalytic Study of the Child 16 (1961): n.d.

¹²⁶ Hultberg, op. cit., 111.

¹²⁷ Tangney, op. cit., 5. References are to H. B. Lewis, op. cit., and T. J. Scheff, "The Shame-Rage Spiral: A Case Study of an Interminable Quarrel," in H. B. Lewis (ed.), The Role of Shame in Symptom Formation (Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 1987), 109-149.

- ¹²⁸ Mollon, op. cit., 208. References to:
 Sidney Levin, op. cit.
 H. Kohut, The Restoration of the Self (New York: International Universities Press, 1971).
- ¹²⁹ Ben Sorotzkin, "The Quest for Perfection: Avoiding Guilt or Avoiding Shame?," Psychotherapy 22 (1985): 567.
- ¹³⁰ Reizler, op. cit., 459.
- ¹³¹ Morrison, op. cit., "Working With Shame," 488.
- ¹³² Severino, McNutt, and Feder, op. cit., 98. Quoting H. Kohut, "Thoughts on Narcissism and Narcissistic Rage," in R. S. Eissler, Anna Freud, M. Kris, A. Solnit (eds.), The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child (New York: Quadrangle Books, 1972), 27:360-400.
- ¹³³ Michael H. Kernis, B. D. Grannemann, and L. C. Barclay, "Stability and Level of Self-Esteem as Predictors of Anger Arousal and Hostility," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 56 (1989): 1019. Reference to R. H. Turner, "The Self-Conception in Social Interaction," in C. Gordon & K. J. Gergen (eds.), The Self in Social Interaction (New York: Wiley, 1968), 93-106.
- ¹³⁴ Patton, op. cit., 14.
- ¹³⁵ Kaufman, op. cit., 15.
- ¹³⁶ John S. Savage, "Ministry to Missing Members," Leadership (Spr. 1987): 116-121.
- ¹³⁷ Ibid.
- ¹³⁸ Merete G. Nergaard and G. Silberschatz, "The Effects of Shame, Guilt and the Negative Reaction in Brief Dynamic Psychotherapy," Psychotherapy 26 (Fall 1989): 330-337. Confirming this is another study:
 E. Marziali, C. Marmer, and J. Krupnick, "Therapeutic Alliance Scales: Their Development and Relationship to Psychotherapy Outcome," paper presented to the Society for Psychotherapy Research, Oxford, England, July, 1979.
- ¹³⁹ Patton, op. cit., 96.
- ¹⁴⁰ Gershen Kaufman, The Psychology of Shame (New York: Springer, 1989), 181.
- ¹⁴¹ Ibid., 103.
- ¹⁴² Ibid.
- ¹⁴³ Levin, op. cit., 356.

¹⁴⁴ J. Randall Nichols, "Facing Shame: Families in Recovery," Journal of Pastoral Care 16 (June 1987): 171.

¹⁴⁵ Erikson, op. cit., 252.

¹⁴⁶ Tangney, op. cit., 5.

¹⁴⁷ Savage, "Ministry," op. cit.

¹⁴⁸ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 137-8.

¹⁴⁹ Robert James Sinclair, Neurotics in the Church (Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1963), 112.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 43.

¹⁵¹ Savage, Apathetic, op. cit., 98.

¹⁵² Ibid., 116.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 5.

¹⁵⁴ The exact nature of the situations and persons have been changed in the paragraphs below.

CHAPTER FOUR

¹⁵⁵ Fictitious name.

¹⁵⁶ Fictitious name.

¹⁵⁷ Fictitious name.

¹⁵⁸ Fictitious name.

¹⁵⁹ Lyle Schaller, Assimilating New Members (Nashville: Abingdon, 1978), ch. 5.

¹⁶⁰ Wayne Kritsberg, The Adult Children of Alcoholics Syndrome (New York: Bantam, 1988), 18-20.

CHAPTER SIX

¹⁶¹ TOSCA, Test of Self-Conscious Affect. June Price Tangney, P. E. Wagner, and R. Gramzow, 1989. The TOSCA is an improvement of the SCAII (Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory) of Tangney et al., 1988. Two recent studies

provide support for the reliability and validity of the TOSCA as the interval level of measurement.

¹⁶² Richard M. Jaeger, Statistics: A Spectator Sport 2nd ed. (Newberry Park: SAGE Publications, 1990), 63.

¹⁶³ Tangney, Wagner, and Gramzow, 1989, op. cit.

¹⁶⁴ June Price Tangney, "Assessing Individual Differences in Proneness to Shame and Guilt: Development of the Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 59 (1990): 102-111.

¹⁶⁵ Telephone interview with Professor Tangney, March 22, 1990.

¹⁶⁶ Two of the 64 statements were inadvertently omitted by computer error when the test was given. See Appendix for the entire TOSCA with the omitted statements marked with an asterisk. In a telephone interview with Dr. Tangney, March 22, 1990, Dr. Tangney stated that for the purposes of this dissertation there would be no significant statistical effect from leaving out the two statements, which were not on the shame-proneness scale.

¹⁶⁷ Abbreviations used for convenience.

¹⁶⁸ Rev. Joe Pittman Peabody, "The Invisible Congregation: A Study of Attitudes Among Inactive and Active Church Members," D. Min. Dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1980.

¹⁶⁹ Joint Committee on Testing Practices of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education, "Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education," The Tenth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Jane Close Conoley and Jack J. Kramer, eds. (Lincoln: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, 1989), 1011-1014.

¹⁷⁰ See Appendix.

¹⁷¹ See the key for an explanation of the abbreviations at the bottom of the calculations for both churches, p. 91.

¹⁷² Terminology from John Savage, Apathetic and Bored Church Member, op. cit.

¹⁷³ Tangney, "Assessing," op. cit., 108-109.

CHAPTER SEVEN

¹⁷⁴ An r of $-.549$ would have been sufficient, with 21 pairs, to be significant at the 1% level.

¹⁷⁵ To arrive at the figure of 5.6, the math was done as follows. The range was from 15 to 75 on the shame scale of the TOSCA. If, for example, a person's score was 63, then 15 was subtracted from 63 and the result was divided by 75 - 15, or 60. In this example, the math would be $63 - 15$ divided by $75 - 15 = .8$ or 8 on a scale from 1 to 10.

CHAPTER EIGHT

¹⁷⁶ Leon Wurmser, M. D., The Mask of Shame (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1981), p. vii. Quoting tractates Sotah and Baba Metzia, from the Talmud.

¹⁷⁷ Patton, op. cit., 41-42.

¹⁷⁸ Patton, ibid., 42-3. Quoting Lyn Bechtel Huber, "The Biblical Experience of Shame / Shaming in Biblical Israel in Relation to Its Use as Religious Metaphor" (Ann Arbor: University Microfilms, 1983), 207-8.

¹⁷⁹ Cavanaugh, op. cit., 37.

¹⁸⁰ Bradshaw, op. cit., viii.

¹⁸¹ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 125.

¹⁸² Reizler, op. cit., 458.

¹⁸³ Robert Young, Analytical Concordance to the Bible (1964; reprint, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972).

¹⁸⁴ William Wilson, Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies (McLean, VA: MacDonald, n.d.), 22.

¹⁸⁵ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 41.

¹⁸⁶ Wilson, op. cit., 23.

¹⁸⁷ Benjamin Davidson, The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), 270.

¹⁸⁸ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 18.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

¹⁹⁰ Kaufman, op. cit., 17.

¹⁹¹ Ibid., 18.

¹⁹² Ibid., 64.

¹⁹³ Ibid., 40.

¹⁹⁴ Wurmser, op. cit., 7, 257.

¹⁹⁵ Richard C. Trench, Synonyms of the New Testament repro. of 9th ed, London, King's College, 1880 (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1973), 66.

¹⁹⁶ Ibid.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 67.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ W. E. Vine, Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words (Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1981), 98.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

²⁰¹ The word for shame in Philippians 3:19 is aischune (social disgrace), which see below. However, though aischune is more towards social disgrace while aischron is more towards gross immorality, clearly the meaning overlaps in Philippians 3:19.

²⁰² William Springborn, Step One: The Foundation of Recovery (Center City, MN: Hazelden, 1983), 4.

²⁰³ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 64.

²⁰⁴ Trench, op. cit., 69.

²⁰⁵ See:

Sandra M. Harrison, "Inner Healing and Secular Psychotherapy: Methodological Similarities," Ph. D. Diss., Emory University, 1987.

Nancy J. Stiehler-Thurston, op. cit.

David Seamands, op. cit.

²⁰⁶ Thomas C. Oden, Pastoral Theology: Essentials of Ministry (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983), 197-8. Quoting Gregory of Nazianzus, Theological Oration II, paragraphs 28-33, H. Wace and P. Schaff, eds., A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church (New York: Christian, 1887-92), vol. 3, 210-11.

²⁰⁷ St. Augustine, Confessions, II., 3. Tr. Rex Warner, The Confessions of St. Augustine (New York: Mentor Books, New American Library, 1963), 43-44. Bold italics not in original, placed for emphasis.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., II, 4; *ibid.*, 45.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., II, 9; *ibid.*, 51.

²¹⁰ St. Augustine, Sermons, 88, 5; *ibid.*, 457.

²¹¹ St. Augustine, Confessions, II, 7; *ibid.*, 49.

- ²¹² St. Francis, Admonitions, 23. Father Paschal Robinson, The Writings of Saint Francis of Assisi (Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1906), 17.
- ²¹³ Ibid., 48, 68.
- ²¹⁴ Ibid., First Rule of Friars Minor, 11. Ibid., 46.
- ²¹⁵ G. K. Chesterton, St. Francis of Assisi (1957; reprint, New York: Doubleday, 1990), 47.
- ²¹⁶ Ibid.
- ²¹⁷ St. Francis, op. cit., First Rule of the Friars Minor, 7. Op. cit., 40.
- ²¹⁸ Erik Erikson, Young Man Luther: A Study in psychoanalysis and History (New York: W. W. Norton, 1958), 136.
- ²¹⁹ Ibid., 139. Quoting Luther, Tischreden (Weimarer Auggaben), III, No. 3556.
- ²²⁰ Ibid., 139. IV, No. 4174.
- ²²¹ Ibid., 252.
- ²²² John Wesley, Sermon #15,2, Sermons on Several Occasions (1746; reprint, Longon: Epworth Press, 1975), 174.
- ²²³ Ibid., Sermon 8, p. 85.
- ²²⁴ Ibid.
- ²²⁵ John Wesley, "Of the Church," 23, Sermons on Several Occasions (1786; reprint, ed. Albert Outler, John Wesley (New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), 315.
- ²²⁶ Ibid., 178, "Rules of the United Societies, #4.
- ²²⁷ John Wesley, Rule 16, "Orders of a Religious Society Meeting in Fetter Lane," David Watson, The Early Class Meeting (Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1985), 198.
- ²²⁸ Ibid., 197.
- ²²⁹ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 130.
- ²³⁰ David Seamands, Healing Grace (Wheaton: Victor Books, 1989), 153.
- ²³¹ See chapter three of this dissertation. Also, see Cavanaugh, op. cit., chapter five, "The Shame-Anxiety Cycle."

²³² Lowell L. Noble, Naked and Not Ashamed (Jackson, MI: Jackson Printing, 1975).

²³³ Carl D. Schneider, Shame, Exposure and Privacy (Boston: Beacon Press, 1977).

CHAPTER NINE

²³⁴ Ernest Kurtz, "Shame in the Eighties," Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 2.

²³⁵ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 162-3.

²³⁶ Robert Langs, M. D., Rating Your Psychotherapist (New York: Ballantine, 1989), 58.

²³⁷ Kaufman, Psychology of Shame, op. cit., 161.

²³⁸ Ed Ramsey, "From Guilt Through Shame to AA: A Self-Reconciliation Process," Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 87.

²³⁹ Winston M. Sherwick, "Helping Troubled Churches," Leadership (Winter 1983): 60.

²⁴⁰ Elisabeth Kubler-Ross, M. D., On Death and Dying (New York: Macmillan, 1969), 75-98.

²⁴¹ Jennifer Crocker et al., "Downward Comparison, Prejudice, and Evaluations of Others: Effects of Self-Esteem and Threat," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52 (1987): 907.

²⁴² Richard L. Bergstrom, "The Pastor as Lightning Rod," Leadership (Fall 1987), 100.

²⁴³ Harper and Hoopes, op. cit., 222.

²⁴⁴ John Patton, "Human Forgiveness as Problem and Discovery," The Christian Century (Sept. 11-18, 1985): 797.

²⁴⁵ Bradshaw, op. cit., 207-8.

²⁴⁶ David G. Martin, Counseling and Therapy Skills (Monterey, CA: Brooks / Cole Publishing, 1983), 61.

²⁴⁷ The first seven items come with minor adaptations from Bruce Fisher, "The Process of Healing Shame," Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 25-38.

²⁴⁸ Patton, "Human Forgiveness," op. cit., 797.

²⁴⁹ Small groups are effective only when the shame-prone person has reached a sufficient level of self-worth and autonomy, according to J. Russell Burck, "Shame and Guilt in Illness," Care-Giver: Journal of the College of Chaplains 5 (Sept. 1988): 90-100. See also Bruce Fisher, op. cit.

²⁵⁰ Merle A. Fossum and Marilyn J. Mason, Facing Shame: Families in Recovery (New York: W. W. Norton, 1986), 24-5.

²⁵¹ Bradshaw, op. cit., 209-213.

²⁵² Stiehler-Thurston, op. cit., 17, 30.

²⁵³ William Shakespeare, "Romeo and Juliet," The Works of William Shakespeare (Roslyn, NY:: Black's Readers Service, 1937), Act III, Scene 2.

²⁵⁴ Schaller, op. cit., 117-21.

²⁵⁵ Kenneth C. Haugh, interviewed by Cynthia B. Castle, "Expert Says 'Active Caring Will Restore Members,'" United Methodist Reporter 135 (July 15, 1988): 1.

²⁵⁶ G. R. Semin and A. Manstead, "The Social Implications of Embarrassment Displays and Restitution Behavior," European Journal of Social Psychology 12: 370.

²⁵⁷ Patton, "Human Forgiveness," op. cit., 797.

²⁵⁸ Carl Schneider, op. cit., 134. Quoting C. S. Lewis, They Asked for a Paper (London: Geoffrey Bles, 1962), 205.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Augsburger, David. Anger and Assertiveness in Pastoral Care. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979.
- Augustine, Confessions, II., 3. Tr. Rex Warner. The Confessions of St. Augustine. New York: Mentor Books, New American Library, 1963.
- Benedict, Ruth. The Chrysanthemum and the Sword. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1977.
- Borysenko, Joan. Guilt Is the Teacher, Love Is the Lesson. New York: Warner Books, 1990).
- Bradshaw, John. Healing the Shame that Binds You. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, 1988.
- Cavanaugh, Eunice. Understanding Shame: Why It Hurts, How It Helps, How You Can Use It to Transform Your Life. Minneapolis: Johnson Inst., 1989.
- Chesterton, G. K. St. Francis of Assisi. 1957. Reprint. New York: Doubleday, 1990.
- Cleaver, Eldridge. Soul on Ice. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1968.
- Conrad, Joseph. Lord Jim. 1899. Reprint. New York: Bantam, Doubleday, 1981.
- Cook, Thomas D., and Charles S. Reichardt. Qualitative and Quantitative Methods in Evaluation Research. Beverly Hills: SAGE Publications, 1979.
- Egan, Gerard. The Skilled Helper, 3rd ed. Pacific Grove: Brooks / Cole, 1986.
- Erikson, Erik. Childhood and Society. 1950. Reprint. New York: W. W. Norton, 1963.
- . Young Man Luther: A Study in psychoanalysis and History. New York: W. W. Norton, 1958.
- Fossum, Merle A., and Marilyn J. Mason. Facing Shame: Families in Recovery. New York: W. W. Norton, 1986.
- Francis, Admonitions, 23. Father Paschal Robinson. The Writings of Saint Francis of Assisi Philadelphia: Dolphin Press, 1906.
- Freud, Sigmund. "New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-Analysis." Standard Edition. London: Hogarth, 1964.

- Harper, James M., and Margaret H. Hoopes. Uncovering Shame: An Approach Integrating Individuals and Their Family Systems. New York: W. W. Norton, 1990.
- Hawthorne, Nathaniel. The Scarlet Letter. 1850. Reprint. New York: New American Library, Nal Penguin, 1980.
- Jaeger, Richard M. Statistics: A Spectator Sport, 2nd ed. Newberry Park: SAGE Publications, 1990.
- Kaufman, Gershen. Shame: The Power of Caring. Rochester, VT: Schenkman Books, 1985.
- . The Psychology of Shame. New York: Springer, 1989.
- Kritsberg, Wayne. The Adult Children of Alcoholics Syndrome. New York: Bantam, 1988.
- Kubler-Ross, Elizabeth, M. D. On Death and Dying. New York: Macmillan, 1969.
- Langs, Robert, M. D. Rating Your Psychotherapist. New York: Ballantine, 1989.
- Lewis, Helen Block. Shame and Guilt in Neurosis. New York: International Universities Press, 1971.
- Lewis, Clive S. A Grief Observed. 1961. Reprint. New York: Bantam, 1976.
- Lynd, Helen Merrell. On Shame and the Search for Identity. New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958.
- Martin, David G. Counseling and Therapy Skills. Monterey, CA: Brooks / Cole Publishing, 1983.
- McSwain, Larry L., and William C. Treadwell, Jr. Conflict Ministry in the Church. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1981.
- Noble, Lowell L. Naked and Not Ashamed. Jackson, MI: Jackson Printing, 1975.
- Oden, Thomas C. Pastoral Theology: Essentials of Ministry. San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1983.
- Outler, Albert. John Wesley. New York: Oxford University Press, 1964.
- Patton, John. Is Human Forgiveness Possible? Nashville: Abingdon, 1985.
- Piers, G., and M. B. Singer. Shame and Guilt: A Psychoanalytic and a Cultural Study. Springfield: Charles C. Thomas, 1953.
- Potter-Efron, Ronald, and Patricia Potter-Efron. Letting Go of Shame: Understanding How Shame Affects Your Life. San Francisco: Hazelden, Harper & Row, 1989.

- Savage, John S. The Apathetic and Bored Church Member. Pittsford, New York: LEAD Consultants, Inc., 1976.
- Schaller, Lyle. Assimilating New Members. Nashville: Abingdon, 1978.
- Schneider, Carl D. Shame, Exposure and Privacy. Boston: Beacon Press, 1977.
- Seamands, David. Healing Grace. Wheaton: Victor Books, 1989.
- Shelley, Marshall. Helping Those Who Don't Want Help. Carol Stream: Word Books, 1986.
- Sinclair, Robert James. Neurotics in the Church. Westwood, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1963.
- Springborn, William. Step One: The Foundation of Recovery. Center City, MN: Hazelden, 1983.
- Tomkins, Silvan S. Affect, Imagery, Consciousness: The Negative Affects. 2 vols. New York: Springer, 1963.
- Watson, David. The Early Class Meeting. Nashville: Discipleship Resources, 1985.
- Wesley, John. Sermons on Several Occasions. 1746. Reprint. Longon: Epworth Press, 1975.
- Wurmser, Leon, M. D. The Mask of Shame. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University, 1981.
- Zonie, Billy, et al. The Tale of the Possum. Philadelphia, MS: Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, 1985.

Articles

- Adler, Alfred. "Advantages and Disadvantages of the Inferiority Feeling." H. L. Ansbacher and R. Ansbacher (eds.), Superiority and Social Interest. 1933. Reprint. Evanston: Northwestern University, 1970.
- Anderson, Herbert. "Human Forgiveness Is Possible." Journal of Pastoral Care 40 (June 1986): 173-79.
- Ausubel, David. "Relationships Between Shame and Guilt in the Socializing Process." Psychological Review 62 (1955): 378-390.
- Babcock, Mary K. "Embarrassment: A Window on the Self." Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour 18 (Dec. 1988): 459-83.
- Bergstrom, Richard L. "The Pastor as Lightning Rod." Leadership (Fall 1987): 95-100.

- Burck, J. Russell. "Shame and Guilt in Illness." Care-Giver: Journal of the College of Chaplains 5 (Sept. 1988): 90-100.
- Crocker, Jennifer, et al. "Downward Comparison, Prejudice, and Evaluations of Others: Effects of Self-Esteem and Threat." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 52 (1987): 907-16.
- Deigh, John. "Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique." Ethics 93 (Jan. 1983): 225-45.
- Demo, David H. "The Measurement of Self-Esteem: Refining Our Methods," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 48 (1985): 1490-1502.
- Fienberg, S. E. "The Collection and Analysis of Ethnographic Data in Educational Research." Anthropology and Education Quarterly 8 (1977): 50-57.
- Fisher, Bruce. "The Process of Healing Shame." Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 25-38.
- Fisher, Sebern F. "Identity of Two: The Phenomenology of Shame in Borderline Development and Treatment." Psychotherapy 22 (Spr. 1985): 101-109.
- Gomberg, Edith S. "Shame and Guilt Issues Among Women Alcoholics." Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 139-155.
- Gross, Edward, & Gregory P. Stone. "Embarrassment and the Analysis of Role Requirements." The American Journal of Sociology 70 (July 1964): 1-15.
- Hultberg, Peer. "Shame — A Hidden Emotion." Journal of Analytical Psychology 33 (1988): 109-26.
- Kernis, Michael H., B. D. Grannemann, and L. C. Barclay. "Stability and Level of Self-Esteem as Predictors of Anger Arousal and Hostility." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 56 (1989): 1013-1022.
- Kurtz, Ernest. "Shame in the Eighties." Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 1-6.
- Levin, Sidney. "The Psychoanalysis of Shame." International Journal of Psychoanalysis 52 (1971): 355-362.
- Miller, Rowland S. "Empathic Embarrassment: Situational and Personal Determinants of Reactions to the Embarrassment of Another." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 53 (1987): 1061-1069.
- Mollon, Phil. "Shame in Relation to Narcissistic Disturbance." British Journal of Medical Psychology 57 (1984): 207-14.
- Morrison, Andrew P., M. D. "Shame, Ideal Self, and Narcissism." Contemporary Psychoanalysis 19 (Apr. 1983): 295-318.

- "Working with Shame in Psychoanalytic Treatment." Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association 32 (1984): 479-505.
- Nergaard, Merete, and G. Silberschatz. "The Effects of Shame, Guilt and the Negative Reaction in Brief Dynamic Psychotherapy." Psychotherapy 26 (Fall 1989): 330-337.
- Nichols, J. R. "Facing Shame: Families in Recovery." Journal of Pastoral Care 16 (June 1987): 169-174.
- Patton, John. "Human Forgiveness as Problem and Discovery." The Christian Century (Sept. 11-18, 1985): 795-7.
- Petronio, Sandra. "Communication Strategies to Reduce Embarrassment Differences Between Men and Women." The Western Journal of Speech Communication 48 (Winter 1984): 28-38.
- Ramsey, Ed. "From Guilt Through Shame to AA: A Self-Reconciliation Process." Alcoholism Treatment Quarterly 4 (Summer 1987): 87-107.
- Reizler, Kurt. "Comment on the Social Psychology of Shame." American Journal of Sociology. 48 (Jan. 1943): 457-465.
- Sattler, Jerome. "A Theoretical, Developmental, and Clinical Investigation of Embarrassment," Genetic Psychology Monographs, 71 (1965): 19-59.
- Savage, John S. "Ministry to Missing Members." Leadership (Spr. 1987): 116-121.
- Scheff, Thomas J. "Shame and Conformity: The Deference-Emotions System." American Sociological Review 53 (June 1988): 395-406.
- Semin, G. R., and A. Manstead. "The Social Implications of Embarrassment Displays and Restitution Behavior." European Journal of Social Psychology 12: 367-377.
- Severino, Sally K., M. D., Edith R. McNutt, M. D., & Samuel L. Feder, M. D. "Shame and the Development of Autonomy." Journal of the American Academy of Psychoanalysis 15 (1987): 93-106.
- Sherwick, Winston M. "Helping Troubled Churches." Leadership (Winter 1983): 60.
- Sorotzkin, Ben. "The Quest for Perfection: Avoiding Guilt or Avoiding Shame?" Psychotherapy 22 (1985): 564-571.
- Tangney, June Price. "Assessing Individual Differences in Proneness to Shame and Guilt: Development of the Self-Conscious Affect and Attribution Inventory." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 59 (1990): 102-111.

Miscellaneous Sources

- Capshaw, Cheryl. "Strategy for Small-Membership Churches Considered." United Methodist Advocate, 13 Sept. 1989, 1.
- Davidson, Benjamin. The Analytical Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970).
- Harrison, Sandra. "Inner Healing and Secular Psychotherapy: Methodological Similarities." Ph. D. Diss., Emory University, 1987.
- Haugh, Kenneth C. Interviewed by Cynthia B. Castle. "Expert Says 'Active Caring Will Restore Members.'" United Methodist Reporter 135 (July 15, 1988): 1.
- Joint Committee on Testing Practices of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association, and the National Council on Measurement in Education. "Code of Fair Testing Practices in Education." The Tenth Mental Measurement Yearbook, Jane Close Conoley and Jack J. Kramer, eds. Lincoln: The Buros Institute of Mental Measurements, 1989, 1011-1014.
- Marziali, E., C. Marmer, and J. Krupnick. "Therapeutic Alliance Scales: Their Development and Relationship to Psychotherapy Outcome." Paper presented to the Society for Psychotherapy Research, Oxford, England, July, 1979.
- Peabody, J. P. "The Invisible Congregation: A Study of Attitudes Among Inactive and Active Church Members." D. Min. Dissertation, Asbury Theological Seminary, 1980.
- "Shame." Oxford English Dictionary, Compact Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971, Vol. II, p. 2767.
- Shakespeare, William. Hamlet. Wm. Farnham, ed. New York: Viking Penguin, 1985.
- . "Romeo and Juliet." The Works of William Shakespeare. Roslyn, NY: Black's Readers Service, 1937.
- Stiehler-Thurston, Nancy J. "From Disgrace to Grace: Theory and Treatment of Shame." Annual Convention of the Christian Association for Psychological Studies, Dearborn, MI, May 3-6, 1990.
- Tangney, June Price. "Moral Affect: The Good, the Bad, and the Ugly." Paper presented at the 1988 meetings of the American Psychological Association, Atlanta.
- Vine, W. E. Vine's Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testament Words. Old Tappan, NJ: Fleming H. Revell, 1981.
- Wilson, William. Wilson's Old Testament Word Studies. McLean, VA: MacDonald, n.d.

Young, Robert. Analytical Concordance to the Bible. 1964. Reprint. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972.

